DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 000 HE 017 858

TITLE Foreign Students and Institutional Policy: Toward an Agenda for Action. A Report of the Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 82p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Admission; *College Students; *Enrollment Trends; Federal Aid; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; Majors (Students); *Public Policy; *School Policy; Student Exchange Programs; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS Canada; Foreign Educational Credentials; France; United Kingdom; United States; USSR; West Germany

ABSTRACT

The costs and benefits of enrolling foreign students at U.S. colleges and universities and implications for institutional policy are discussed in 5 chapters. In chapter 1, information is presented on: numbers of foreign college students in the United States, the national origins of foreign students, the location of foreign students in the United States, the institutions foreign students attend, and their fields and levels and study. Foreign student policies in the following countries are described in chapter 2: France, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, and the Soviet Union. United States policy toward foreign students is covered in chapter 3, with attention to: federal support for student exchange; additional federal support; admissions; disclosure of information; employment and research by foreigners; and foreign students and state policy. Fiscal considerations discussed in chapter 4 include: foreign students and institutional economics, and student services for foreign students. Finally, in chapter 5, the need for policy is considered in light of enrollment projections, trends by nationality, projections by discipline, and predicted levels of study. Appendices include: statistics on foreign students in the United States, and information on resource organizations that provide programs, publications, and services that benefit institutions who recruit and enroll foreign students. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251000

FOREIGN STUDENTS AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICY

TOWARD AN AGENDA FOR ACTION

A Report of the Committee
on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE017 858

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN STUDENTS
AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICY

Appointed by the American Council on Education

Rufus L. Barfield
President, Bowie State College

Richard Berendzen, *Chairman*
President, The American University

Alice Chandler
President, State University College of New York at New Paltz

John Cribbet
Chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Robert H. Edwards
President, Carleton College

Paul A. Elsner
Chancellor, Maricopa County Community College District

Casper Harris
Vice President and Treasurer, Howard University

Leslie Koltai
Chancellor, Los Angeles Community Colleges

Richard Krasno
Executive Vice President, Institute of International Education

John F. Reichard
Executive Vice President, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

William J. Sullivan, S.J.
President, Seattle University

Kenneth R. Wadleigh
Vice President and Dean of the Graduate School, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

© 1982 American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

American Council on Education. Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy.
Foreign students and institutional policy.

Bibliography: p.
1. Students, Foreign—United States. 2. Universities and colleges—United States—Administration. I. Title.
LB2376.A568 1982 378'.1982 82-1620
AACR2

Printed in the United States of America

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Copies of this book have been distributed to each member of the American Council on Education by the Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy. Additional copies may be obtained at $5.00 per copy postpaid from the Division of International Education Relations, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Contents

Foreword, *by J. W. Peltason* vii
Preface, *by Richard Berendzen* ix
Note on Scope, Terminology, and Statistics xii

Summary Findings and Recommendations 1

1. The Foreign Student Population in U.S. Higher Education 8
   The National Origins of Foreign Students • The Locations of Foreign Students in the United States • The Institutions Foreign Students Attend • Fields and Levels of Study • Who Are These Foreign Students?
2. Foreign Student Policy in Other Nations 17
   France • The United Kingdom • The Federal Republic of Germany • Canada • The Soviet Union • General Trends in the Host Countries
3. United States Policy Toward Foreign Students 26
   The Federal View of Foreign Students • Federal Support for Student Exchange • Additional Federal Support • Foreign Students, Foreign Policy, and Institutional Concerns • Admission, Institutions, and the Law • Disclosure of Information: Requests and Requirements • Employment, Research, and Federal Policy • Foreign Students and State Policies
4. Fiscal Considerations 37
   A Macroeconomic View • Foreign Students and Institutional Economics • The "Hidden Scholarships" • Foreign Student Services
5. Foreign Student Trends and the Need for Policy 44
   Enrollment Projections • Trends by Nationality • Projections by Discipline • Predicted Levels of Study • The Need for Policy

Appendixes
A. Statistics on Foreign Students in the United States 55
B. Two Statements on Foreign Student Policies 58
C. Resources for Managing Foreign Student Programs 61

Sources and References 69

Foreword

The American Council on Education has long had interest in foreign student issues. At the request of its member institutions and associations, ACE has from time to time intervened with foreign embassies in attempts to resolve problems such as difficulties in transferring currencies needed to meet the educational expenditures of foreign students; it has questioned certain regulations promulgated by the Justice Department; it has worked with institutions to ensure the physical safety of foreign students during time of extreme tension.

The Council, it is now apparent, should perform a leadership role wider than simply putting out fires. In the interests of its member institutions and the nation as a whole, the Council should address the broader issues of which occasional crises are but symptomatic, issues that affect the institutional life of our colleges and universities. Perhaps at one time, presidents and boards of trustees could comfortably relegate foreign student matters to foreign student advisors, registrars, admissions officers, and other specialists. Those days are over. The increasing numbers of foreign students have raised a host of institutional issues: one way or another, foreign students have—and will continue to have—significant effects on the fabric of higher education.

What if the rate of increase in numbers of foreign students in the future is comparable to that prevailing over the last few decades? What implications will that increase have for institutional planning in colleges and universities? Are institutional changes necessary to accommodate the special needs of foreign students? Who pays the costs of educating foreign students, and who should be paying them? What is the proper role, from the institutional point of view, of the federal and state governments in regulating and supporting foreign students? What happens if changes in world politics force large numbers of foreign students to return home? In sum, what should constitute sound, defensible, institutional policy toward foreign students over the foreseeable future?

To assist institutions in thinking through these and other issues, the American Council on Education, in October 1980, created a special Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy. It charged the Committee to produce a report that would describe various ways in which foreign students affect the institutions of higher education and would offer action-oriented advice for policy makers. The Committee, composed largely of college and university presidents, was asked to study the issues from the perspective of the chief executive officer and to offer counsel to their colleagues who occupy that position.

The Committee had a year-long existence. Under its direction, staff members of the Council prepared background papers and initial drafts which were reviewed by Committee members and frequently shared with others for comment. Committee and staff members consulted widely with other persons in government, on campuses, in the associations, and in foreign embassies. In June 1981, the Committee held a public session at The American University to review progress and to solicit additional advice. As a final step, the resulting draft was then shared and discussed with college and university presidents attending the Council's 1981 annual meeting. In short, the Committee proceeded in an open manner and made every attempt to consult the several constituencies which have an interest in the foreign student community.

The Council anticipates that the Committee's report and recommendations will provide colleges and universities with a basis for formulating institutional policy with respect to foreign students. By inference, the document should also be of assistance to others who are concerned with framing public policy. I strongly believe that the Committee's efforts will strengthen the capacity of U.S. higher education and the nation to deal reasonably and sensitively with this country's foreign student population.

The work of the Committee was supported by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the Council is much in its debt. The contents of the report do not, of course, necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation.

J. W. Peltason, *President*
American Council on Education

Preface

Foreign students and institutional policy constitute but part of a larger, more embracing subject—global education and international understanding.

The Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy of the American Council on Education focused, rightly, on the costs and benefits, the opportunities and responsibilities arising from the massive influx of foreign students into the United States and their effects on our national life as well as on our higher education enterprise.

Nonetheless, the issues can be perceived in another way, one stemming uniquely from my professional field, astronomy. Here, then, I give a highly personalized interpretation. In our day-to-day world, we necessarily become preoccupied with our own hopes and aspirations, our own failings and travails. Occasionally, when we can withdraw briefly from our individual concerns, we see a globe populated by billions of people, grouped into some hundred and fifty independent nation-states. But from the astronomer's perspective, the world and its peoples can be viewed in a strikingly different way.

As seen from the astronomer's orbiting satellite, no geopolitical boundaries are visible. With pride in one's own nation and respect for others, from this vantage point we see not the multicolored map of politics, history, and tradition; but, instead, we see a shared globe of finite and limited resources. And when the astronomer looks outward rather than downward, Earth becomes simply planet number three, a blue marble in the black eternal night, orbiting an ordinary star on the periphery of an unexceptional galaxy in a typical part of the cosmos. In a universe dotted with more stars than there are grains of sand on Earth, our miniscule planet shrinks almost to infinitesimal nothingness. Yet it remains our home—our origin and our future, our cradle and our grave. Delicate, fragile, and irreplaceable, the Earth may be small in the grander scheme of things, but it is all we have.

And one harsh prospect comes joltingly to mind as I consider it from an astronomer's perspective: Either we shall learn how to live together on this planet or surely we shall die together on this planet. No single enterprise—whether foreign policy or global education—can ensure international understanding and peace. But insofar as the exchange of peoples and ideas contributes to bettered international understanding and the possibility of greater cooperation and peace, then the true meaning and cardinal value of global education becomes clear.

Beyond the requisite I-20 forms and enrollments, beyond revenues and expenses, to me the overriding goal of international understanding is what makes this report, this study, and this subject so profoundly important. So challenging. So imperative.

For the Committee, I express gratitude to the many people from the embassy community, professional organizations and associations, here and abroad, the federal government, and campuses throughout the land who gave freely of their time and counsel to assist preparation of the report. There were so many who were of help that I hope they will accept a collective thanks. A few persons deserve special mention. The Reverend William C. McInnes, S.J., president of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, argued so persuasively for the paramount importance of faculty interest in foreign student programs that the Committee incorporated not only his point but also paraphrased his statement. Committee member Robert H. Edwards, when the Committee was struggling over its introductory statement, prepared wording with which all members could feel comfortable. The ACE staff deserves special thanks for providing far more than logistical support for the Committee's operations: Charles H. Lyons bore major responsibility for overseeing completion of the project and also did the research for, and was principal author of, the main text. Becky H. Owens provided significant support, as did Cassandra A. Pyle who, during the course of the deliberations, moved from her position as a member of the Committee to the directorship of ACE's Division of International Education Relations.

Finally, on behalf of the Committee, I wish to join Council President J.W. Peltason in acknowledgment to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for its grant to support the project.

RICHARD BERENDZEN, *Chairman*
Committee on Foreign Students
and Institutional Policy

Note on Scope, Terminology, and Statistics

This report employs the term "foreign students" to refer to citizens of other countries who are permitted by law to be temporary residents in the United States for the primary purpose of receiving an education and who have declared to the United States government an intention to return to the home country after completing their programs of study. Foreign students in this restricted sense are permitted to enter the United States on only two kinds of visas: the unsponsored student (F) visa, and the sponsored student (J) visa. This report, moreover, focuses on foreign students who are enrolled in institutions of U.S. higher education. The charge to the Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy came from the American Council on Education on behalf of its institutional membership, and the Committee therefore employs the term "higher educational institutions" to refer to the aggregation of accredited nonprofit colleges and universities that are eligible for institutional membership in the Council.

This scope is more restricted than that employed by other investigators of foreign students in higher education and results in disjunctions between certain statistics used and the direct subjects of this report. Specifically, statistics cited in this report (particularly in the opening summary and chapters one and five) rely heavily on census data published by the Institute of International Education (IIE) in its yearly surveys of foreign students, *Open Doors*. Those censuses count as foreign students noncitizens enrolled in higher education who hold visas other than the F or J (refugees, for example). However, 90 percent or more of all those counted by IIE as foreign students in its surveys held F or J visas, and thus the discrepancy, while important to note, is not large.

The above qualifications, of course, do not apply to the discussion in chapter two on foreign students in other countries. Nations define foreign students in different ways, and their systems of postsecondary education also vary. Rather than indulging in a complex sorting out of these differences, the report simply accepts each nation's definition of foreign students and of higher education, as well as accepts its statistics on enrollments.

Summary Findings and Recommendations

Whatever the state of this nation's aid and exchange programs, whether or not foreign nations have encouraged and supported their young people to pursue studies in the United States, and frequently regardless of the state of political relations between their countries and this nation, foreign students have sought out higher education here and our institutions have welcomed them.

In the United States, given the federal system and its public and private education traditions, it is unrealistic to expect precise regulation or coordination of this vast, diverse flow—currently more than 300,000 at some hundreds of institutions throughout the nation. Equally unlikely is a perfect market in which all foreign students would be matched to institutions ideally suited to their individual needs and to the expectations of their families and sponsoring organizations. Until recently, in its loose-jointed way, the market functioned well enough.

Today, however, foreign students and their treatment in the United States have become matters newly contentious. Iranian student agitations and the U.S. government response, concerns about foreign researchers as a threat to national security, the bill-paying practices of some groups of foreign students—these and other concerns have all been picked up by the news media. But the principal reasons foreign students are now being both criticized and courted as never before are rooted in the current crises in U.S. higher education itself—its financial distress and the prospects of declining enrollments. On the one hand, the costs of foreign students to the institutions, their sheer numbers and concentrations, the programs they require; on the other hand, their contributions to sagging enrollments, to science and scholarship, to campus life and local economies—all are beginning to be debated. The situation requires a summary of what is known and being done about foreign students in the United States.

This report is designed for colleges and universities (the American Council on Education's principal constituency), state university sys-

tems and legislatures, and agencies of the federal government. The principal target, however, is the individual academic institution. To the institution and its top-level administration, the report seeks to provide information and recommendations. It also issues a reminder: the honor of U.S. higher education, higher education's reputation abroad, and the impressions created of our national society will be influenced far into the future by the manner in which colleges and universities recruit foreign students, educate them, and respond to them as human beings while they are here.

Summary Findings

The Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy makes a number of major findings, which can be grouped under five headings.

1. Foreign Student Numbers

- Approximately 312,000 foreign students were enrolled in U.S. postsecondary education in the academic year 1980–81. Eighty percent were from the developing world (of which almost one-half were from OPEC countries); the great majority were privately supported, and only 2 percent were supported by programs of the United States government. Two-thirds of the foreign students were undergraduates. For the past several years, increasing numbers of students have come from the richer nations and from urban, wealthier backgrounds.
- Foreign students are not new on U.S. campuses, but what is new is the rapid increase in their numbers. After World War II, although the foreign student population began to double with each passing decade, its effects were obscured by the rapid growth in total enrollments in higher education. In the past few years, the rate of increase has quickened, with enrollments now doubling every five to six years. If this trend continues, the number of foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities could reach a half-million by 1985 and a million or so by 1990. Numbers could also flatten or diminish, depending on a host of factors.

2. The National Context

- In the United States, practically all major decisions about foreign student admissions and education are taken by individual colleges and universities and by state systems of higher education; these units also bear many costs incurred in educating foreign students. A "U.S. policy" toward foreign students is thus the aggregate of thousands of local decisions.

- Although the education of many thousands of foreign scholars, scientists, professionals, and other potential leaders clearly engages vital national interests, a national philosophy or policy on foreign students scarcely exists. Policy is left to be deduced from scattered references in federal exchange program legislation (for example, that governing the Fulbright program), which declare student exchanges to be of national importance, and in the generally facultative policies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). Federally sponsored exchange programs, however, have been shrinking severely in recent years. Additionally, the INS and the academic community have recently been at odds over the application, interpretation, and enforcement of certain rules and regulations affecting foreign students.
- State governments, until recently, have taken little legislative notice of foreign students, but may well come to interest themselves in setting enrollment policies and fee structures for foreign students.
- Nationwide data with respect to foreign students are increasingly inadequate in both extent and accuracy. Surveys of costs of foreign students to the U.S. institutions and of foreign student financial contributions to the institutions and local economies, institutional models of foreign student programs, and estimates of the effects of this nation's massive training effort scarcely exist. Also lacking are national forums where institutions may discuss foreign student issues among themselves and with the federal and state governments. Consequently, in Washington, in statehouses, and on most campuses, the complex effects of foreign student enrollments on the quality and character of higher education in the United States, on institutions, and on surrounding communities are not well understood, nor are they receiving serious analysis.

3. Institutional Concerns

- Policies in U.S. universities and colleges concerning the admission, education, and social accommodation of foreign students vary from the comprehensive to the nonexistent, and programs, from the carefully designed and well administered to the ad hoc and expedient.
- The probable decline in domestic student enrollments, which are projected from the next decade's college-age population, has enhanced foreign students' attractiveness to admissions offices. This statement should not imply that foreign students might be accepted to fill otherwise vacant places without receiving fair educational value.

In some instances, however, U.S. institutions have misrepresented themselves and compromised their admissions practices in order to attract foreign students. In a few cases they have violated federal laws.

- Financial costs and benefits of foreign students also newly preoccupy institutions. In light of imperfections in data on, and analyses of, these matters, the Committee is prepared to conclude only that, in general, institutions tend to underestimate the costs of educating foreign students (especially, institutions that provide programs of supporting services to foreign students, or that experience difficulties in obtaining payments of foreign students' bills) and to overestimate their net benefit to the institutional budget. Measuring costs and benefits—and to whom—becomes even more complex when other considerations are factored into the calculus: the contributions that foreign students make to local economies, and foreign students' contributions to the national interests as friendly foreigners.
- The Committee found, nevertheless, that the predominant institutional reasons for admitting foreign students remain strongly traditional: Institutions continue in their conviction that the international flow of knowledge is both good in itself and is a vital ingredient in advancing scientific and scholarly knowledge. They take pride in the quality of their higher education and honestly desire to share it with students whose educational alternatives are unavailable or inferior. And they hold a further belief that domestic students profit from mingling with students from other cultures.
- But the Committee also found that foreign students are all too often an unrealized, underutilized, and unintegrated resource for relieving the startling lack of knowledge among domestic students about international matters.

4. The Human Dimension

- Complaints of foreign students include, of course, the normal discontents of all students, domestic and foreign, about housing, food, and courses of study. To these dissatisfactions, foreign students add their particular problems with summer employment and course suitability, and on to the more disturbing, though infrequent, allegations of misleading advertising and the use of "headhunters" who are paid a fee by U.S. institutions for each foreign student produced.
- In recent years, abrasions, distinct in character and origin, have arisen between local communities and foreign students. In some

instances the causes have been student importation of political grievances or assertion of political differences with the United States. In others, problems have been financial—sometimes the embarassing difficulty of obtaining timely tuition payments from their home countries. In still other cases, the customs and the religious and dietary differences of concentrated numbers of students have produced irritations in relatively unsophisticated neighboring communities.

- Most often, the Committee concluded, foreign students complain about loneliness, lack of institutional interest, and insensitivity. These complaints constitute some evidence that, in twenty-five years as hosts to foreign students, U.S. colleges and universities have become less attentive, imaginative, and organized in their capacity to respond to the needs of foreign students on their campuses. The clumsiness or insensitivity of federal, state, community, or institutional handling can, the Committee believes, be averted in many instances by forethought and planning.

5. The International Context

- After decades of laissez faire or of strongly encouraging policies, many governments of the industrialized West are limiting their numbers of foreign students or are sharply increasing the fees charged foreign students. They are doing so in order to reduce the costs of educating foreign students to the institutions or, often, to the national economy, or to protect domestic students from being crowded out of competitive professional fields of study—or for both reasons.
- These foreign governmental initiatives may affect student flows to this country. The United States currently attracts fewer than one-third of the million-plus students now enrolled worldwide in postsecondary education outside their own countries. U.S. policy-making agencies, both governmental and private, have little knowledge about overseas policies, some of which they may begin to imitate, even though the policies themselves are on occasion being questioned in the countries whose governments have introduced them.
- In general, the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries continue to seek and subsidize foreign students in increasing numbers, particularly those from Third World countries.
- The Committee finds little evidence that there is systematic discourse between U.S. government agencies and colleges and universities

concerned with foreign students and those countries, for example, of Western Europe whose experience could be highly germane and instructive.

Recommendations

The Committee offers the following recommendations aimed at two different sectors of the higher education enterprise.

1. To National Associations and Agencies

- The American Council on Education should develop a mechanism for discussing issues and policies related to foreign students with U.S. government officials. The diversity of higher education, coupled with the numbers of foreign students, makes it imperative that the government seek advice and counsel on matters that directly affect institutions. Subjects appropriate for the discussion include immigration policy, fellowship programs, and new government initiatives, as well as regulations concerning the involvement of foreign students and scholars in certain scientific research projects.
- The educational community of the United States, through its national organizations, should vigorously promote the expansion of federal international education programs, particularly those of the International Communication Agency, the Department of Education, and the Agency for International Development. Colleges and universities are a major resource in the private sector and can enhance the efforts and multiply the effects of federally supported initiatives.
- The American Council on Education should convene a task force broadly representative of U.S. institutions of higher education and of the professional associations with particular concern for international education to develop a plan for gathering and sharing information on foreign students. The task force should seek several objectives or means to facilitate those objectives: to identify data and research needs; to establish mechanisms to benefit institutions of higher education in making decisions about foreign students; to converse with government officials who have responsibility in the development of public policy with respect to foreign students and scholars; and to share information with other host nations, particularly those of the North Atlantic community.

2. To Individual Institutions and University Systems

- Institutions that seek to serve foreign students should formulate sound policies to guide administrators, faculty, and students toward a constructive and productive relationship with and for foreign students. Such a formulation should include commitment to a program of self-regulation and self-study such as that described in the *Principles for International Educational Exchange* of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Recruitment efforts should be consistent with the so-called Wingspread Principles. (See Appendix B for excerpts from the two statements.) The institution's chief executive officer should provide impetus to the self-study effort.
- The institutional policy program must concern itself with the educational experience of the foreign student in its totality: the quality of the environment; the experiences the student encounters in the United States; the substance and quality of the educational program.
- Institutions should treat financial factors with extreme care in making determinations about foreign students. Fiscal considerations should be among, but not the primary, criteria in making decisions on admissions of foreign students.
- Institutions should apply tuition policies as equitably to foreign students as to domestic students. Any special fees or rates established as applicable to foreign students must have an explicit rationale, and special services should be provided as a concomitant of charging those fees.
- Institutions should encourage faculty interest in, and attention to, international education, for faculty support and participation are vital to creating a receptive climate for foreign students.

ONE

The Foreign Student Population in U.S. Higher Education

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, fewer than about 25,000 foreign students were in the United States at any given time. Since World World II, however, this population has exhibited a Malthusianlike growth, nearly doubling with each passing decade. The best data on foreign students have been produced by the Institute of International Education (IIE), a private organization, which for the academic year 1979–80 reported 286,343 foreign students in U.S. colleges and universities. Its data for the 1980–81 academic year are being tabulated, and an estimate places the number at some 312,000, a 9 percent increase over 1979–80. Although their numbers have grown steadily over the past quarter-century, foreign students thus far have constituted only a small proportion of the total enrollments in higher education (in 1980–81, estimated at 2.7 percent). Predicted declines in domestic enrollments and projected increases in foreign student numbers could, however, alter this balance significantly over the next decade or two.

The increase in the foreign student population has been accompanied by marked changes in its demographic composition. In earlier years, high proportions of the foreign students came from European countries; at present, foreign students from certain Third World nations predominate. The academic levels of those enrolled have fluctuated over the years, as have fields of study and patterns of financial support. In short, foreign students in the United States represent a growing, dynamic population about whose size, demographic characteristics, and potential influences much needs to be learned.

The National Origins of Foreign Students

More than half of all foreign students in the United States in recent years have come from the Middle East and Asia; about 15 percent from the Caribbean and Central and South America; 13 percent from Africa

(including North Africa); 8 percent from Europe; 5 percent from North America (that is, Canada and Bermuda); and about 1.5 percent from Oceana.[1] Over the past twenty-five years, consistently the highest proportion of foreign students has come from Asia, for most years hovering around 50 percent, and always the lowest proportion, from Oceana, around 1 percent. Between these extremes, notable shifts have occurred in the proportions of foreign students coming from the other major regions. The percentage of students from the African continent has risen steadily, while the proportions from Latin America and the Caribbean and from North America have shown steady declines.

Although rankings have changed over the years, the top ten sending nations in any given year regularly have provided more than half of all foreign students. For 1979–80, the top ten sending countries were Iran (51,310 students), Taiwan (17,560), Nigeria (16,360), Canada (15,130), Japan (12,260), Hong Kong (9,900), Venezuela (9,860), Saudi Arabia (9,540), India (8,760), and Thailand (6,500). The total number of students from these ten countries (157,180) made up 55 percent of all foreign students enrolled in that academic year.

Since 1954–55, five countries—Canada, Taiwan, India, Japan, and Iran—regularly have ranked among the top ten sending countries. Others—for example, Venezuela, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, and Mexico—have provided students in numbers sufficient to rank either among or near the top ten. Thus, despite overall numerical increases and certain shifts, there has been a certain measure of consistency in the national composition of the foreign student population. The consistency appears to be based less on geographic proximity and language affinity (though both factors are obviously important) and more on the special historic and diplomatic ties which the United States has developed with certain other nations.

The national-origin composition of the U.S. foreign student population has exhibited changes in other respects. First, the rankings of the various sending nations have changed over time. Some countries—like India and Korea—have steadily placed lower in rank; others—like Saudi Arabia and Nigeria—lately have risen rapidly into the top ten listing. It is, though, unwise to make too much of these rankings as they may obscure important, overall increases in numbers: while the

1. This report uses IIE's categories of world regions. These follow continental rather than regional designations. For example, the Institute does not aggregate data for the region commonly called the "Middle East." Instead, countries in that region are, in IIE's categories, split between "Asia" and "Africa."

rankings of countries like India, Korea, and the Philippines have fallen over recent years, such nations now send many more students here than in years past.

Without question, the most dramatic recent shift in national groupings is the rising numbers of students from OPEC countries. Until the early 1970s, the proportion of students from countries which now have OPEC membership remained relatively constant at about 10 percent of the total in any given year. During the 1970s, however, these numbers increased phenomenally: today 100,000 (35 percent of all foreign students) come from OPEC countries. Every OPEC nation except Gabon has a significant contingent of students in the United States. Ten of OPEC's thirteen members each enrolls more than a thousand students here annually.

Less striking but equally noteworthy have been the growing numbers of students from the non-OPEC Third World countries which have attained a level of economic development that generally renders them ineligible for traditional forms of foreign aid. These are countries like Taiwan, Hong Kong, Mexico, Thailand, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, and Brazil. From these seven countries alone the United States receives a combined total of 50,000 foreign students (almost 20 percent of the total count).

Another 50,000 students come from the poorer countries which constitute the remainder of the Third World. At present, about 22,000 students come from the poorer nations of Asia. Just under half of that number come from a single country, India. Approximately 14,000 students come from the poorer countries of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Slightly more than 10,000 come from countries in sub-Saharan Africa other than South Africa and Nigeria, with Kenya, Ethiopia, and Ghana accounting for almost half of this total. Students from the poorer countries of North Africa number just over 2,000, half of whom come from Egypt.

In sum, the foreign student population in the United States is overwhelmingly drawn from the Third World. Only about 20 percent of foreign students come from industrialized nations. Of the remaining 80 percent, 35 percent come from Third World nations which are members of OPEC; another 25 percent from the few, relatively rich (though non-OPEC) countries of the developing world; and the remainder, around 20 percent, are citizens of the poorer and poorest Third World nations.

The Locations of Foreign Students in the United States

Currently and historically, the foreign student population has been distributed unevenly throughout the United States. Certain regions and states customarily have tended to attract more foreign students than others. Yet over time some significant shifts have occurred in locations which parallel shifts in the domestic population. During the past two decades the proportion of foreign students in the Northeast and Midwest has steadily declined, while the Pacific region has experienced a moderate increase in its share of the total foreign student population. The greatest increases have occurred in the South and Southwest. Notably, the influx of students from OPEC countries has been a significant factor in the geographic shift of the foreign student population to the Pacific Coast and to the South, particularly the Southwest. In general, foreign students from Europe are clustered in schools in the Northeast and Midwest; from Asia, the Midwest and Pacific; from Latin America, the South and Southwest; from Africa, the Midwest and South.

Aside from regional trends, several items are worth noting on a state-by-state basis. First, somewhat consistently, the same few states regularly have played host to a far higher than average proportion of foreign students. California, New York, Texas, Massachusetts, Illinois, Michigan, the District of Columbia, and Pennsylvania have ranked in the top ten host states list since 1954–55. But this top ten list is not static. Two Midwest states, Indiana and Ohio, recently have been displaced by one South and one Southwest state, Florida and Oklahoma. Moreover, Texas has moved up considerably in the rankings over the past decade: in 1979–80, it displaced New York as the state with the second highest number of foreign students (behind first-ranked California).

The top ten host states in any year have provided education for more than half of all foreign students enrolled in the United States for the past quarter-century. But the number of students enrolled in these states as a percentage of the total population has declined as a result of increased enrollments in other states, particularly those in the South, Southwest, and Far West.

The Institutions Foreign Students Attend

Although the greatest numerical increases in foreign student enrollments have taken place at four-year institutions, a proportionately

small but growing number of the foreign students attend two-year colleges. In 1970–71, about 15,000 students were enrolled in junior and community colleges. By 1979–80, the number had risen to about 50,000. The national figures conceal considerable variations in enrollment patterns from state to state. In 1979–80, for example, three states alone (California with 13,370, Florida with 5,116, and Texas with 4,630) accounted for almost half of all foreign students attending two-year institutions. In contrast, in thirteen other states, two-year foreign students accounted for 5 percent or less of the respective foreign student populations.

Foreign students in both two- and four-year institutions tend to enroll in public rather than private institutions, at a ratio of about two to one—a ratio lower than that for the domestic student population (currently about three to one). Since public educational institutions have continued to attract ever larger pools of foreign students over recent years, the ratio of private to public institution enrollments may be changing. States in the Northeast enroll foreign students in private institutions at rates much higher than the national average. The proportion in private institutions is 65 percent or more in Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont. In contrast, in the South and Southwest states, proportions in public institutions tend to be higher than the national average. States in the Midwest more closely approximate the two-to-one national ratio of public-private enrollments, with considerable variation among various states.

One surprising fact is that students from OPEC countries attend public institutions at a rate somewhat higher than the average for all foreign students—for 1979–80, 72 percent as opposed to 65 percent. In that year, Iranian, Libyan, and Nigerian students in public institutions outnumbered their compatriots in private colleges and universities by a ratio of three to one; for Iraq students, the ratio was four to one. In part, this preference for public institutions is owed to the concentration of OPEC students in the South and Southwest, where public institutions offer the kinds of programs—particularly in engineering—that attract foreign students. It further reflects that increasingly sophisticated sponsors and individual applicants abroad recognize the cost advantages of public in relation to private institutions.

Traditionally, a relative handful of institutions has had a very large share of foreign students. In 1979–80, fifty-eight universities each enrolled more than 1,000 foreign students. Collectively, the foreign

student enrollments in these fifty-eight institutions numbered about 85,000, or 30 percent of the total foreign student population reported. There is considerable diversity among the fifty-eight in the size of their foreign student populations vis-à-vis their total enrollments. Ten of these institutions had foreign student populations in excess of 10 percent of their total enrollments; three, in excess of 20 percent. On the other hand, the foreign student populations of most universities with more than 1,000 foreign students, while large in absolute terms, represented comparatively small proportions of total enrollments. Apart from the 30 percent concentration in fifty-eight institutions, the remaining 70 percent were enrolled in institutions whose foreign student populations were characteristically much lower than 1,000. The percentage of students enrolled in institutions that have fewer than 1,000 foreign students is likely to rise even more rapidly than in the past as a greater variety of higher education institutions admit larger numbers of foreign students.

Fields and Levels of Study

Over the past quarter-century, engineering has easily been the most popular field of study among foreign students. More than one in four foreign students in the United States in recent years was studying some aspect of engineering. Growing in popularity over the years have been the management and business fields, which most recently have attracted about 16 percent of all foreign students. The largest decrease has been in the humanities, although other fields—ranging from the social and natural sciences to the health professions—have also declined in popularity. Curiously, given the agriculturally based economies of most Third World countries, the proportion of foreign students pursuing agricultural studies has been consistently low, always at around 3 percent of total over the past twenty-five years. Foreign students, however, do account for a high proportion of those pursuing the doctorate in agriculture-related fields.

With respect to the level of study, the overall proportions of foreign students enrolled at the graduate and undergraduate levels have exhibited some shifts. From 1955 to 1970, the percentage of foreign students at the graduate level rose steadily from 39 percent to almost 50 percent. Beginning in the early 1970s, and coincident with the influx of students from OPEC countries, the percentage of graduate students began to decline steadily. It is currently about 33 percent. Put another way, the remarkable growth in foreign student numbers over the past

decade has taken place at the undergraduate level. Still, the number of foreign students in graduate institutions remains large, in 1979–80, 94,000. Moreover, the concentration in certain fields—notably engineering—has been striking: foreign students currently constitute a sizable proportion of students at the higher levels of study in the fields of advanced technology.

Who Are These Foreign Students?

Two factors limit attempts to describe with clarity the personal characteristics of foreign students. The first drawback is that all generalizations are inevitably suspect, given the size and diversity of the foreign student population. Second, surprisingly few attempts have been made to collect information about personal traits of foreign students in the United States. To be sure, occasional studies have been done, generally at the institutional level, and IIE does collect national data on some personal characteristics. The latter data reveal, for example, that one-fifth of all foreign students are married and that three-fourths are male. IIE also collects some data (described elsewhere in this report) on personal finances. But neither IIE nor any other national organization systematically collects data that contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the foreign students: who they are, and how and why they decide to study in the United States. From recent research in other countries, however, it is possible to deduce something about general characteristics.

Useful data are presented in a 1977 survey in Canada, which touched on the personal characteristics of its foreign students. There are differences, of course, between the foreign student populations in Canada and in the United States. For example, students from Hong Kong make up 25 percent of the foreign student population in Canada, but only 4 percent in the United States, and while Iranians constitute the largest foreign student contingent in the United States, they are comparatively few in Canada. With such differences put aside, the remainder of Canada's foreign student population is a nationality mix remarkably like that in the United States. Further, comparable data on sex distribution and on levels and fields of study suggest strong similarities.

The Canadian study found "a strong element of urban cosmopolitanism among foreign students." About three-quarters of these students grew up in an urban environment, with almost 60 percent from cities or near cities with at least 300,000 people. Undoubtedly, the large

number from Hong Kong skewed these data, but even when those students were factored out, the urban description still held. As might be expected, the urban description became less accurate progressively, according to the data, for students from the industrialized, then the more advanced developing, and, last, the poorer developing countries. While proportionately more students with a rural background were found among those from the poorer nations, even for them the numbers of urban dwellers exceeded those coming from rural areas. Foreign students also were found generally to be older, and they tended to have had more significant pre-university work experience than their Canadian counterparts. These characteristics held particularly for students from less-developed countries, many of whom had spent several years in professional positions before coming to Canada.

The survey also confirmed that most foreign students from rich and poor nations alike tended to belong to the more privileged classes in their home countries, and tended to be the children of entrepreneurs, businessmen, and professionals. Moreover, it found that many families were in the habit of sending their sons and daughters abroad for an education: more than half of the students surveyed reported that one or more of their parents or siblings had studied overseas, of whom, in total, more than half had studied in Canada. The inference drawn—that sending families probably prefer to send their children to particular countries—is likely to be as valid for the United States as for Canada.

Many of the findings from the Canadian survey were closely similar to the results from a 1980 survey of foreign students in Great Britain. The similarities lend further confidence in inferring descriptions applicable to the U.S. situation. As in the United States and Canada, a high proportion (around 70 percent) of Britain's foreign students come from the developing world. They tend to be male and unmarried at rates remarkably comparable to those for foreign students in the United States; and, like foreign students here, they are heavily concentrated in fields of science and engineering. That survey found as well that foreign students were likely to be the sons and daughters of businessmen, professionals, and civil servants, people who were more likely than others in their home societies to have completed a higher education. "In other words," said the British report, "the average overseas student is not the child of poor or ill-educated parents."

While personal contacts do seem to be important determinants in a decision to seek an education abroad, a clear sense of what impels a

student to go abroad for education remains uncertain. Some pioneering work on this subject has been done by the European Cultural Foundation's Institute of Education. In its recent study the argument is made that foreign student mobility can be most usefully explained by reference to a broad, and not simply economic, "cost-benefit" model. Quite apart from the financial costs, the student considers other "costs" which he or she will have to confront: overcoming a language barrier, for example, or having to adapt to a different culture. Consciously or not, the student will weigh those costs against perceived benefits which might accrue, such as enhancing one's career prospects or having a valuable cultural experience. In making the judgment, the student is presumed to reflect on the resources at his or her disposal which could help to meet the "costs." In addition to money, those resources could include knowledge of the language in question or contacts in the foreign country. Only when convinced that the "benefits" outweigh the "costs" is the student likely to elect to go abroad. This model has appeal as a way to frame hypotheses about the personal motivations that bring foreign students to the United States. Clearly financial ability is a key factor, but money alone is not enough. Other much more personal factors are significant in the student's decision to separate from family and friends in order to come to the United States.

A final comment of distress. So little research on the personal characteristics of foreign students in the United States has been done that in order to say anything sensible on the subject necessitates drawing inferences from work done abroad. This lack of attention perhaps indicates that people in this country do not know much about foreign students--who they are, where they come from, what they aspire to achieve from studying here—and thus far have not been greatly interested in finding out. The situation is lamentable and disturbs the common assertion that foreign students represent an educational resource for our society. That they do, but for the most part it is a largely untapped resource. If higher education is serious about better serving the interests of foreign students and of the domestic population as well, then clearly much more attention needs to be paid to foreign students as living people rather than faceless numbers.

TWO

Foreign Student Policy in Other Nations

The United States is not alone in feeling the effects of rapid increases in foreign student populations. In 1960, the total number of foreign students throughout the world was around a quarter-million. That number has now grown to roughly a million. Although the United States has more foreign students than any other nation, a majority of the world's foreign students are in other countries. In fact, the U.S. share of the global foreign student population has decreased in recent years; thus the increase in foreign student numbers has had proportionately greater effects in certain other host countries than it has in the United States.

The United States is alone among the major receivers of foreign students in not having instituted national measures and mechanisms to regulate foreign student flows. (The qualified exception is Canada, where such matters are regulated by the provinces.) In the United States the governance of higher education is far more decentralized than in most other countries, whose national governments directly or indirectly exercise considerable control over their systems of higher education. The United States government is unlikely to devise national policies comparable to those fashioned by other national governments, and in certain respects such a course would be undesirable. Nevertheless, those in higher education who are responsible for deciding institutional policies may benefit from an awareness of developments in other host countries: the concerns voiced about large foreign student populations, and strategies employed in dealing with foreign students.

The six countries which have the largest numbers of foreign students are the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, and the Soviet Union. These six countries enroll two-thirds of the world's foreign students. This chapter will look at policies which have emerged in the last five countries, and then offer some general comments about the situation abroad.

France

France traditionally has maintained a system of open access to its universities. Although its admissions standards are among the highest in the world, any French student who applies and qualifies has the right of admission to higher education. French applicants need not even preregister to gain admission, but simply appear at registration time with the correct credentials in hand. In addition, French tuition fees are negligible.

Until very recently, French hospitality went so far as to afford foreign students the same kind of open access benefits extended to French citizens. For that reason, France has always had a high number of students from abroad: in recent history, it has ranked second only to the United States in the number of foreign students within its borders (currently, about 110,000). France's foreign students account for about 13 percent of its total university enrollment—the highest proportion of any major recipient. A good many of those come from nations outside Europe: to this day, particularly in Africa, governments of France's former colonies still design their education systems to enable the best students ultimately to matriculate in France.

In the early 1970s, concerns arose when the foreign student contingent in France was approaching 100,000. One cause for concern was costs. Still another was that an increase in numbers might be accompanied by an overall decline in the quality of applicants. Thus, France chose to regulate the foreign student influx through tightening quality control. In part, this control is exercised at the institutional level through the imposition of *numerus clausus*, that is, ceilings on numbers of foreign students to be admitted to certain schools or departments. Admission of foreign students under *numerus clausus* is by competitive examination.

Characteristically, though, student flow into France is for the most part centrally administered. In 1974, the French government instituted a system of preregistration for foreign students. Since that year, they have been required to submit their credentials by May 31 preceding fall registration to allow universities to scrutinize candidates with unusual care. Since many universities tended to ignore this government policy, in 1977 the system was tightened. The government informed the French universities that they would not receive their subsidies for any foreign student who failed to apply by the May 31 deadline. Also, student visas were restricted to those applicants who could demonstrate proof of preregistration to French embassy officials in the home

country. When even these measures failed to achieve fully satisfactory results, the French government, on December 31, 1979, issued the so-called *Décret Imbert*.

The Imbert decree required that foreign students from non-francophone backgrounds must, in order to be issued a visa, pass a French language examination in the home country, produce evidence of sufficient maintenance funds, and submit proof of preregistration. The most important part of the decree, however, established a radically new mechanism for the admission of foreign students. Henceforth, the initial decision about whether a student was to be permitted entry into France, and even the decision whether to forward his or her credentials to the institution of choice for final approval, were given to a single commission, which in essence is the central clearinghouse for foreign student entry into France.

France's new admissions system does provide for numerous exceptions. In 1980, only about a third of all foreign applicants went through the Imbert mechanism. The system is so new that it is too early to judge its effectiveness and effects, and the election of President Mitterand causes some speculation about its continuation. Whatever the outcome, it is significant as an example of a system whereby, through the admissions process, national policy pertaining to foreign students can be implemented. Although the Imbert decree does not explicitly so state, the new system provides the French with a tool that may be used to apply national quotas. Specifically, some see behind the Imbert mechanism a not-so-subtle motive to stem the influx of Moroccan students into France.

The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom, with about 60,000 foreign students in its higher educational system, has traditionally ranked third as a Western host to foreign students. Over the past decade, the rapid increases in its foreign student population became a subject of public and parliamentary debate at a level quite unknown in any other country: from 1976 to 1980, there were no fewer than fourteen debates in Parliament on the subject. The public controversy revolved around alleged costs to the British taxpayer in subsidizing the education of foreign students.

At the request of Parliament, the Department of Education and Science was asked in 1978 to estimate the costs to the British treasury of educating foreign students. Its report maintained that for the academic year 1978–79 the British taxpayer subsidized foreign student education

by £153 million. Universities and organizations which work with Britain's foreign student population were quick to question that figure and the way in which it was derived. Nonetheless, the British government accepted it and, beginning in 1979–80, introduced a special schedule aimed at gradually increasing the fees charged to foreign students at a pace intended to achieve "full cost" recovery by 1983.

As in the French case, Britain's new policy contains numerous exceptions. The most important is that students from other member states of the European Economic Community are exempted from the higher foreign student fees because Britain is party to a reciprocal student exchange agreement. Britain also has initiated specific programs of grant awards to enable certain categories of students from developing countries to meet the higher costs. Moreover, foreign students who were already enrolled in their courses at the time the new fees were imposed or arrived soon thereafter are not subject to having their fees raised commensurately with the escalating rates set for later incoming students. Nonetheless, the effects of this policy are becoming evident. In 1980, new enrollments of foreign students dropped 11 percent at universities and 29 percent in polytechnics. More telling, perhaps, the Universities Central Council on Admissions reported that as of November 1980 foreign student applications declined by 43 percent from those in November 1979.

Although the extent of the effects that Britain's new fee schedules will have on future enrollment is uncertain, quite clearly the United Kingdom's role as a major host nation for foreign students has been altered as a result of national policy. Equally clearly, whatever the future holds for Britain will have effects there and in many other host countries as well, particularly the United States.

The Federal Republic of Germany

During the 1970s, the number of foreign students in the Federal Republic of Germany more than doubled to exceed 50,000 by the end of the decade, or 5 percent of total enrollment in postsecondary institutions. The German response to this growth has been to regulate foreign student numbers through the imposition of quotas and to establish a mechanism to ensure an equitable spread of the foreign student population among the several educational institutions.

Over the years, German federal and state governments have worked together to establish general quota systems in order to control all admissions into postsecondary institutions. In conjunction with those

systems, Germany has imposed special subquotas governing the admission of foreign students. Though the final decision in the admissions process lies with the institution, both the federal and state governments establish overall admission policies through special laws. From time to time the government also issues guidelines for restricted admissions of both foreign and domestic students in those fields where the demand for places greatly exceeds their supply (the *numerus clausus* fields). A notable example is the medical and allied health fields, where government policy stipulates that no more than 6 percent of all available places may be reserved for foreign students.

Germany's quotas can also be used to regulate the admission of foreign students by nationality, level of study, and so forth. As a case in point, the Bonn government currently has established a preferential quota system that benefits applicants from certain countries in the developing world and, through quotas, encourages foreign students who wish to study at the graduate level.

Germany, like France, has set up a central mechanism to coordinate the admission of foreign students among the various higher educational institutions. It was established under the aegis of the West German Rectors Conference, and its secretariat is located within the headquarters of the German Academic Exchange Service. The coordinating body differs from its French counterpart in two important respects: First, the mechanism was not imposed on higher education by government, but rather resulted from voluntary action taken by the institutions themselves. Second, its main function has been less to limit overall foreign student numbers than to ensure an effective spread of admitted foreign students among Germany's several higher educational institutions.

Canada

For most of its history, Canada assumed a laissez faire posture toward foreign students remarkably analogous to that of the United States. During the 1970s, the number of foreign students in Canada doubled to its present strength, 40,000. In 1973, the federal government reacted to this situation by tightening its immigration requirements with respect to foreign students and later, through the Canadian Immigration Act of 1978, implemented further restrictions.

The major decisions affecting foreign students, however, have been made at the provincial level, as might be expected given the great power of the provinces vis-à-vis the federal government in Ottawa. Many

important provincial decisions were made in the wake of a 1975 official report on foreign students. That report addressed the explosion in the foreign student population and asserted that unchecked further growth could reach a point where foreign students might outnumber Canadian students. The projection may have been an exaggeration as, at that time, foreign students accounted for only 5 percent of Canada's total higher education enrollment. Accurate or not in its projections, the report galvanized action among the provinces. To respond to the report and to alleviate pressure on their own institutional budgets, the Provinces of Ontario and Alberta announced plans to raise tuition for foreign students to levels above the regular fees charged to Canadian students. In Ontario, surcharges to foreign students were set at $1,500 for university students and $750 for college students, or approximately 150 percent of the tuition charged to Canadians. The surcharge in Alberta was less harsh, 50 percent of the regular tuition fee. Exceptions to these policies were made for students sponsored under Canadian government programs.

In 1977, the government in Quebec adopted the Ontario model, though it exempted not only government-sponsored students but also students from countries with which Quebec had its own special exchange agreements. In that respect, Quebec has set out to do on a provincial level what in most countries is done on a national level. Indeed, Quebecois' feelings of nationalism resulted in a 1981 decision to increase certain fees even further. In effect, most foreign students in Quebec's French-speaking institutions are exempt from this latest increase, whereas it is applicable to foreign students in its English-speaking colleges and universities. The objective in this decision was to correct the imbalance between Quebec's English-speaking institutions, McGill and Concordia, which have the highest proportions of foreign students in all of Canada, while Quebec's francophone schools have the lowest share.

In 1979, the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission, acting for the governments of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, also announced differential fee schedules for foreign students, once again modeled on that of Ontario. In sum, every Canadian province except four (Newfoundland, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia) has imposed special fees for foreign students. The purpose of the increases, provincial leaders have stressed, is less to limit numbers than it is to recover costs. Many in Canada,

however, believe that the overall effect will be a reduction in foreign student enrollments.

The Soviet Union

While many Western nations have taken actions aimed at putting limits on their foreign student populations, Soviet policy has been quite the reverse. A few comments are needed as introduction. First, the Soviet Union rarely shares information on its foreign students with UNESCO or any other international agency. Thus, figures on actual enrollments are fragmentary, educated guesses made by outsiders. An informal estimate is that, in 1980, there were 80,000 foreign students in Russia. Second, the process whereby a student gets to the Soviet Union is an enigma. Most foreign students seem to get there either by receiving an award tendered by the Soviet government to a national scholarship board in the home country, which then nominates the student, or by having made contacts through, and as a result of, Communist-supported international youth organizations. Soviet embassies appear to play some role in student selection, undoubtedly with some measure of collaboration between the Soviet ministries of foreign affairs and higher education. Finally, the Soviet Union has extremely few privately sponsored foreign students. Since all or nearly all foreign students are on state scholarships, the size and composition of that student body is a clear expression of official state policy. Whereas other countries are only now establishing mechanisms that can implement foreign policy objectives, the Soviets have had theirs in place for years.

Soviet scholarships are generous awards. They normally run for five or six years, including one or two years' intensive study of the Russian language, and the awards are offered in many more fields than Western nations make available to their sponsored students. Third World students in the Soviet Union, moreover, are no longer confined to Friendship University (formerly Patrice Lumumba), and can now be found throughout the Russian higher education system.

Probably half of the Soviet Union's foreign students come from Eastern bloc and other Communist nations. Very few Western students are believed to be enrolled in Soviet institutions, but no figures are available for guidance. For numbers of students from non-Communist less-developed countries, fairly good figures have painstakingly been assembled from records of scholarship awards tendered to such students. They show some remarkable trends. In 1975, about 18,000

Third World students were in the Soviet Union; in 1979, the number stood at almost 31,000. The current annual rate of increase is now on the order of 20 percent, the highest rate among the major host countries. In 1979, 12,000 of Russia's Third World students came from sub-Saharan Africa: more than 1,000 each from Ethiopia, Madagascar, Nigeria, and the Sudan. Around 7,000 came from the Middle East (2,100 from Syria); 6,600 from Asia (4,000 from Afghanistan); 2,800 from Latin America; and 1,800 from North Africa.

Other nations of the Eastern bloc have exhibited a similar pattern of growing support for scholarship programs for students from the non-Communist developing world. In 1965, 5,000 students were studying in the Soviet satellite countries of Eastern Europe; in 1975, the number was only 10,000; but in 1979, the number rose to 25,000. As with the Soviets, so in the satellites: sub-Saharan Africans account for a great many of these students (almost 11,000), and Middle Easterners are another sizable contingent (about 6,500). As of December 1979 (the date of the latest unclassified figure), there were 55,000 students from developing nonaligned countries on scholarships in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The number now is probably between 65,000 and 70,000. Clearly Communist nations use their scholarship programs as an increasingly important tool of foreign policy in the Third World.

General Trends in the Host Countries

The five countries described above represent major host nations, and except for Eastern bloc countries, their recent experiences are typical of other receiving countries. Practically every host country has been affected by the stunning increases in foreign student numbers over the last decade, and most Western nations have responded by taking steps to regulate foreign student flows. Whether openly stated or not, economic considerations have been a major impetus for action, though other factors—ranging from maintenance of academic standards to safeguarding of scarce places for domestic students—have also been important stimuli. There is no denying, moreover, particularly where a link has been made between foreign student admissions and immigration policy, that some motives of racial and ethnic discrimination lie behind certain actions.

Regulation of foreign student numbers is generally accomplished in one of two ways: either through imposing a significant increase in tuition rates or through tightening admissions standards. Nations that regulate foreign student flows by raising tuition rates (the United

Kingdom, Canada, and Ireland) generally are those where tuition represents a significant proportion of higher educational revenues. Raising admissions standards seems to be the most widespread regulatory measure used in the non-English-speaking countries of Western Europe. The typical pattern is for a host country to establish quotas for foreign students based on field of study or level of study or both, and to fill those places through competitive examinations. In some instances also quotas are imposed in order to regulate such matters as the proposed duration of stay or the national composition of the incoming foreign student population.

Frequently, regulation of foreign student numbers has occurred as a logical extension of the national practice with respect to admissions. For example, Britain and the Canadian provinces have sought to achieve regulation by taking what they already had in place—relatively high fee schedules—and extending them expressly to affect foreign students. Similarly, Germany has chosen to employ an extension of its existing quota systems to achieve its control over foreign students. In a few cases—France, for one—regulation has been achieved through imposing entirely new procedures.

Whether such mechanisms represent a radical departure from past practice or not, once instituted they can be used to achieve objectives that go far beyond regulating overall student numbers. Importantly, they may be used as stated or implicit tools of diplomacy. Foreign relations use is clearly embodied in the Soviet mechanism. The specific workings may puzzle outsiders, but the effects obviously derive from deliberate national policy decisions.

Although the United States posture toward foreign students is seldom so blatant a reflection of foreign policy considerations, here as well as in other countries there is a relationship between foreign policy and foreign students. That relationship is explored in the next chapter.

THREE

United States Policy Toward Foreign Students

In the United States, the responsibility for thinking through sound strategies for dealing with foreign students lies primarily with the individual college or university. Such strategies must inevitably be framed within the wider context of public policy. To do so requires understanding how the federal government officially regards and affects foreign students, and also understanding the ways in which higher education interacts with government on foreign student matters. Emerging now is the further need to give increased attention to the role that individual state governments will play over the coming years.

The Federal View of Foreign Students

There is no single federal policy statement with respect to foreign students, which is perhaps to be expected, given the constitutional limitations on federal intervention in education matters. References to foreign students are, however, contained in several scattered statutes and regulations. Taken together, those references provide some indication of how this nation officially views students from abroad.

The clearest public definition of "foreign student" is contained in the sterile language of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The foreign student is "an alien having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning, who is a bona fide student qualified to pursue a full course of study, and who seeks to enter the United States temporarily solely for the purpose of pursuing such a course. . . ." Precise though this definition is, the act does not further illuminate the purposes for allowing such students to enter the United States.

Four other pieces of federal legislation do speak to purposes. The oldest of these laws is the United States Information and Exchange Act of 1948, which describes student exchanges and other forms of exchanges as a way to increase "mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries." More

expansive language is contained in the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchanges Act of 1961—the enabling legislation for the Fulbright program. It authorizes student and other exchanges as a means of serving several major purposes:

> to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments and achievements of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world; to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and other countries of the world.

The third piece of legislation is the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the enabling legislation for the Agency for International Development (AID). It empowers AID to sponsor training programs, in the United States as well as abroad, "to promote the economic development of less developed friendly countries and areas. . . ." The fourth law, the unfunded International Education Act of 1966, described the education of "nationals of foreign countries in American schools, colleges, and universities" as one way in which "this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures. . . ."

As discussed below, the federal government has taken actions and issued rules and regulations that further define how Washington views foreign students. But, it must be borne in mind, the fundamental intent of federal policy remains as suggested in the basic legislation. A striking feature in all four statutes is the assumption that encouraging foreign students to come to the United States serves the national interest in positive ways. Variously, student exchange is seen as a way to promote international understanding and cooperation; as a tool to assist in the development of Third World countries; or as an opportunity for us to understand the other peoples of the world, and for those peoples to understand us. In sum, the nation, speaking through its federal legislation, has gone on record as applauding and encouraging student exchange as a means of serving the best interests of the United States.

Federal Support for Student Exchange

The Fulbright and AID legislation provide the enabling laws for the principal programs whereby foreign students come to the United States under U.S. government sponsorship. In addition to the direct benefits

these programs provide, they contribute by setting standards and encouraging new directions for this country's exchange efforts. The Fulbright program, for instance, not only establishes high academic standards that other exchange efforts might emulate, but also serves as an exemplar for kinds and quality of exchanges, for desirable fields of study, for levels and extent of support, and so forth. In a more specialized way, the participant training programs of AID set analogous standards or particular types of education for foreign students from developing countries. Additionally, both the Fulbright and AID programs generate research which produces findings useful to still other exchange programs and, further, pertinent to the needs and conditions of all foreign students.

Because of the pace-setting nature of the Fulbright and AID foreign student programs and the knowledge about the exchange process which they generate, it is particularly unfortunate that financial support for them has steadily declined in recent years. The annual funding for the Fulbright program has remained at a fairly constant level since the mid-1960s without regard for the ravages of inflation. As a result, the purchasing power of the funds has declined: today's allocation buys 60 percent less than it did fifteen years ago. Thus, the number of Fulbright-sponsored students has dropped. In the mid-1960s, the program supported 4,500 foreign students annually. Current funding permits only 2,300 annual awards, half of which provide travel expenses only. Compared with Fulbright students, the number of AID-supported foreign students in academic programs may seem to have declined less dramatically—from 1,600 new entrants in 1970 to a few more than 1,000 in 1980. Additional cutbacks, however, have been achieved through other measures. AID-supported students now stay in this country for shorter periods than did their predecessors, a result of an AID policy that heavily emphasizes one- to two-year master's degree programs. AID has no way of counting precisely the total number of students it currently supports in the United States because sponsorship is spread among so many participant training programs; a reasonable estimate is that the Agency now supports only about 3,000 foreign students in academic programs. In sum, the U.S. government currently supports only about 5,000–6,000 foreign students. That level represents only 2 percent of the entire foreign student population, a drop from 5 percent only five years ago.

The decline in federal support for exchanges is alarming from many perspectives, among them, notably, U.S. efforts pale in comparison

with those of most other industrialized nations. In terms of expenditures, the Soviet Union and France spend far more on educational and cultural exchanges than does the United States. As a proportion of national budgets, the comparison with other countries is even more striking: the French and West German governments each devote 1 percent to educational and cultural exchange activities, whereas the United States government spends less than 0.1 percent on them. The Soviet government sponsors six times the number of foreign students supported by the U.S. federal government; the other Eastern bloc countries collectively sponsor five times as many; France, four times; Britain, twice as many. In the words of a nonprofit exchange organization coalition, the International Educational Exchange Liaison Group, "Both our allies and our adversaries seem fully mindful of the political and economic advantages which accrue when Third World leaders are educated in their countries, are trained to utilize their technologies, and are participants in their social, political and cultural life." U.S. policy makers must similarly be mindful if federally sponsored exchange programs are to have any consequence in the future.

Additional Federal Support

Federal support for foreign student programs extends far beyond the AID and Fulbright scholarship programs. As authorized under the Fulbright legislation of 1961, the U.S. International Communication Agency is empowered to provide certain support services for all foreign students, including the more than nine out of ten who are not federally sponsored. These services include advising potential applicants overseas through ICA posts, sponsoring orientation programs here and abroad, strengthening foreign student offices on campuses, and helping to develop means for foreign students to be learning resources for U.S. citizens. In many cases, the ICA post or Fulbright commission abroad provides the foreign student with an initial overview of institutions comprising U.S. higher education, and provides advice on application procedures. Important as these activities are, especially as the number of foreign applicants increases dramatically, they are funded with increasingly insufficient resources. As a result, some ICA posts abroad have been outstanding centers of information distribution, and others have been much less effective.

Foreign Students, Foreign Policy, and Institutional Concerns

The federal government has on occasion—though not the norm—taken deliberate steps to encourage student exchange as a means of furthering

certain foreign policy objectives. A recent example is the impressive exchange agreement signed by the United States government and the People's Republic of China in October 1978, on the eve of normalization of diplomatic relations. In the wake of this "Memorandum of Understanding," some 6,000 Chinese students and scholars—both private and officially sponsored—have come to U.S. colleges and universities. At the time of the signing, many campus leaders voiced understandable concern and frustration over actions taken by the federal government to commit freely the resources of U.S. higher education in pursuit of a foreign policy objective. They, on whom the responsibility for policy implementation would devolve, complained that U.S. foreign policy interests were being poorly served and U.S. bargaining power reduced by an inadequate understanding on the part of government officials regarding domestic interests and campus constraints.

Thus far, problems have been kept to a minimum, owing to the great intellectual curiosity about China, eagerness to gain access to Chinese institutions, and the dominance of unique "students"—older, more mature, exceptionally talented graduate and postgraduate students who possess a high degree of fluency in English. But the concerns voiced could be borne out, should ever-larger waves of students arrive with less suitable educational preparation and less capacity for cultural adjustment. There is potential for things to go awry: some students are beginning to experience money problems; deficient ability in the English language seems to be a growing problem; and a possible, dramatic escalation in numbers could lead to disastrous consequences unless special care is taken. The recent Chinese experience, though exceptional and dramatic, illustrates the importance that should be attached to adequate consultation between government agencies and colleges and universities, as each sector pursues its appropriate objectives.

The most painful recent episode to illustrate potential conflict between universities and the federal government over an issue of foreign policy came during the Iranian crisis. In the heat of the moment, the federal government sought to exert pressure on Iran by taking such steps as the issuance of regulations aimed at locating Iranian students, limiting their extensions of stay, invalidating the reentry of those who had temporarily left the country, and restricting them severely in adjusting or changing their official status. Many of the regulations issued in the wake of the hostage crisis raised broader

concerns regarding legal rights and institutional responsibilities, treated below. The point here: The government's actions with respect to Iranian students were wholly political, were instigated without regard to educational values and implications, and then were consigned to colleges and universities for purposes of compliance, enforcement, and follow-through.

Conversely, actions taken by U.S. colleges and universities could, quite possibly, precipitate diplomatic crises, much to official consternation. A case in point involves institutional response to the recurrent problem of late tuition payment by Nigerian scholarship boards. So severe has been the situation on many university campuses that often several thousand dollars are routinely owed and students become dependent on the institutional dole. In reaction, some institutions have refused to admit Nigerian students without prepayment of all educational costs. Many others have threatened to take this course of action. This singling out of Nigerians for special treatment is rife with potential for diplomatic repercussions. In consequence, the situation has attracted attention in the Department of State, which recently has placed emphasis on improving relations with Africa's most influential nation and the United States' second largest source of imported oil. Washington officialdom has raised and sought to resolve the student fees issue in discussions with the highest levels of the Nigerian government. While Nigerian officials have been sympathetic to resolving the problems, no solutions have yet been secured. U.S. colleges and universities thus occupy a pivotal position in a delicate diplomatic balance between this nation and an essential friend.

To conclude, decisions reached in Washington can have repercussions on campus, and vice versa. A prudent course, therefore, would be to broaden the scope of discussion between government and the academy with respect to foreign student issues. Government–private sector cooperation is not only possible, but is as well a necessary ingredient in successful exchange programs.

Admission, Institutions, and the Law

The federal government's role in overseeing foreign students is primarily limited to ensuring that these students do not take up residence in the United States, displace U.S. workers from the employment market, or engage in illegal activities. Typically the government is involved only in a *pro forma* procedural fashion with the entry and departure of the foreign student. Once a foreign applicant has begun to seek admission,

major authority resides with colleges and universities to make the appropriate decisions. This discretion, if not properly exercised, could ultimately provide the occasion for government intervention to regulate perceived abuses.

The process whereby foreign students enter the United States directly includes the actions of numerous educational institutions. The relevant institution could be a school, college, university, institute, or other place of formal education or training specifically authorized by government to accept foreign students. Such institutions number several thousand, and each is empowered to send to the students it accepts the official government Form I-20, the "Certificate of Eligibility for F-1 Foreign Student Status."

Over the past couple of years, there has been growing media attention given to I-20 abuses, particularly the issuance to overseas recruitment agents of presigned, but otherwise blank I-20s. In general, schools and institutions that send such forms abroad hope thereby to reduce the time it takes for prospective students to comply with immigration requirements. But granting I-20s in such a manner circumvents the regular admissions procedures stipulated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and thus the issuance of presigned I-20s is illegal. Lately, the Justice Department has become vigorous in prosecuting this kind of visa fraud. From scattered evidence it appears that, although a few higher educational institutions have been implicated, the most flagrant abuses have been committed by proprietary schools. The actual extent of I-20 abuses, however, remains largely undetermined.

Since current legal remedies to I-20 abuses are, to many concerned people, inadequate, changes have been suggested in the way foreign students gain permission to enter the country. Many of the proposed changes are now being studied by the executive branch, and which, if any, will be implemented is difficult to anticipate. Whatever the decisions, institutions must assume greater responsibility for self-regulation of foreign student admissions, not merely in order to avoid legal penalty, but also to preserve the good name of U.S. higher education at home and abroad.

Disclosure of Information: Requests and Requirements

In most cases, the rules and regulations affecting foreign students are viewed within institutions as a bothersome but unavoidable aspect of doing business with the government. At times, however, they have

raised fundamental questions about the proper relationship between the federal government and higher education. Illustrative are some recent rules and regulations that have tested the limits of how much information government may legitimately request colleges and universities to supply regarding foreign students.

In accepting federal authorization to admit foreign students, an educational institution must agree to provide the INS with certain information relating to their faithful attendance. Filing this information is the only clear reporting requirement INS imposes on institutions. Yet foreign students may fall out of legal status in a variety of ways other than failure to meet attendance requirements, for example, by accepting unauthorized employment. Institutions are not required by law to report such infractions to the INS, although the INS and other agencies sometimes seem to hold an unstated expectation that institutions voluntarily will divulge such information. The dispute centers on the degree to which the institutions are or should be viewed as extended agents of the government—cooperating, for example, with INS attempts to locate foreign students in the United States.

The problem is that, while the INS does keep records on the flows of nonimmigrants into and out of the country, it has no effective system beyond the attendance reports for monitoring the whereabouts or activities of foreign students while they are here. INS hopes to impose order on its record keeping by adopting computer-based retrieval systems. In the meantime the INS simply does not have data of its own, and therefore has queried those that do—educational institutions. Colleges and universities, however, are known for guarding their academic records cautiously, and most have chosen to divulge information only to the extent required by law, not beyond. But confusion exists about just how far the law extends.

Asked by the INS to supply it with lists of their foreign students, many institutions have refused and even questioned their own authority to supply such information. The basis for this position is that, although the Privacy Act does not cover nonimmigrant aliens, the Buckley amendment does. Moreover, the "release of information" statement on the back of the I-20, which a student must sign to get a visa and which INS says gives it some authority in requesting institutions to supply a foreign student's current address, has a problem connected with it: the wording of the release form implies that the INS shall take the initiative by furnishing the name of the student to the institution. Since INS records are in disarray, the Service finds it nearly

impossible to supply the names of foreign students at each institution—the very reason it resorted to asking for lists from the institutions in the first place.

To date, INS requests to institutions have focused principally on gathering names and addresses of students, though an exception occurred in early 1979, at the time of the Iranian demonstrations. INS headquarters published a proposed rule that would have had its regional offices conduct personal interviews with all foreign students seeking an extension of stay in the United States. Most of the questions the INS wanted its agents to ask concerned attendance matters, employment, and other appropriate subjects. Controversy emerged, however, over the request to ascertain whether a student had "engaged in any activity deemed inconsistent with his/her continued presence in the United States as a student." The INS in Washington issued no clear guidance about exactly what constituted such activity, and INS regional offices were given wide latitude in interpreting and implementing the new instructions. The regional office in Pittsburgh, for example, proposed a checklist of activities deemed "inconsistent" with valid student status: "i.e., arrested and convicted, violent demonstrations, activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States." To compound matters, the INS would have requested that a special form, to accompany the request for extension of stay, be filled out by an official of the institution in which the student was enrolled. The official was to be asked to "certify . . . to the best of my knowledge" that the student's answers to the questions were truthful.

Under pressure from institutions and educational and exchange organizations, the INS rescinded the proposed procedure. Even so, the proposal pointed up the clear potential for government to place higher educational institutions in compromising positions. If questionable practices are to be avoided, patently there is need for closer communication between higher education and the INS as the Service reevaluates and revises its procedures regarding foreign students.

Employment, Research, and Federal Policy

Despite occasional challenges, American colleges and universities have enjoyed a remarkable degree of freedom from governmental interference in their teaching and research activities. That enduring freedom has led to enormous dividends in the high quality of both instruction

and research, key factors in attracting students from around the world to U.S. campuses.

Ironically, certain government regulations with respect to employment serve to deny many foreign students the full benefits of a U.S. education. It is certainly appropriate for the government to regulate the employment of nonimmigrant aliens so that U.S. citizens and immigrants granted visas for permanent residence are not deprived of job opportunities. This objective is distorted when government regulations inadvertently restrict the foreign student's opportunity for practical experience, which often is an important adjunct to formal classroom instruction.

Under current policy, foreign students are allowed to accept jobs in only three circumstances: With the institution's permission, they may work on campus. They may work part time off campus if INS determines that an unanticipated "economic necessity" has arisen (such as death of the student's supporter at home). And they may, with INS approval, work full time in their chosen fields for up to twelve months in "practical training" following completion of the academic program.

These regulations on employment can adversely affect foreign students and their institutions. In many fields, training is considered incomplete unless it encompasses related work experience. The work element is particularly important for students from the developing world. Current regulations, however, are frequently too restrictive: few employers are prepared to hire employees who are limited to a year's practical training; and, for many occupations, twelve months' training is insufficient. A group of institutions on which current regulations impinge severely are those whose curricula are built around concurrent work experience; particularly notable are institutions that offer "cooperative education" programs. Because, in general, no provision is made for a foreign student still taking classes to accept employment in an internship or trainee capacity, foreign students in institutions with cooperative programs are shortchanged in their education.

Certain prohibitions also affect foreign student involvement in government-funded research projects. Restrictions vary among governmental agencies, with the result that confusion abounds. Some agencies have a justified interest in restricting alien and foreign student participation in classified research, but do not invoke such sanctions. Other agencies, with less justification, do impose restrictions. Because of this murky situation, foreign students lose important opportunities for

research experience, and the institutions—and the nation—lose qualified research assistance.

Clearly, current rules and regulations dealing with the employment of foreign students need to be reviewed and revised. Just as clearly, a strong case can be made for liberalizing many of the stipulations.

Foreign Students and State Policies

Until recently most states took no legislative notice of foreign students unless it was to encourage their presence. Over the past few years, however, and owing primarily to financial pressures, state support has begun to disappear. In 1981 alone, the Oregon state legislature allowed to lapse its special student exchange relationship with British Columbia, and New York's tuition waiver program for foreign students was terminated. More distressing, and in the wake of the Iranian disturbances of 1979, a few legislators in about a dozen states introduced various measures to charge foreign students in state-supported institutions significantly increased rates of tuition. Those measures died within the course of legislative sessions except, in June 1981, such a provision did pass the Florida legislature, only to be vetoed by the governor.

In one state, a nonlegislative measure has taken effect. In 1979, Idaho's state university system adopted a special "nonresident-alien fee." The flat fee—a nominal $50 over and above the out-of-state rate charged foreign students—was established purely as a revenue-producing device, seemingly without being designed to support any special services for foreign students. In June 1981, two foreign students at Idaho State University filed separate class action suits charging unlawful discrimination against foreign students.

While the disposition of the two cases is thus far unresolved, two points are clear. First, the introduction of special tuition rates for foreign students raises some fundamental issues of policy (discussed in the next chapter). Second, much public policy with respect to foreign students could, from now on, be decided at the state level. This recent development points up the obvious, growing need to focus new attention on how the individual states treat their foreign students, and to gather information on the national level with respect to state policies.

FOUR

Fiscal Considerations

The overall condition of the United States economy is now forcing college and university administrators to make profoundly difficult choices, to weigh carefully the relative worth of various programs and services, to search for new sources of revenue, and to justify expenditures. In this context, the economic impact of foreign students on the nation and its higher educational institutions is drawing increasing attention. Two factors limit discussions of that impact: First, research on the economic effects of educating foreign students is still in an early stage. Second, the diversity of the U.S. higher educational system inhibits the collection of generalizable data. The fiscal circumstances at one institution may differ totally from those at a neighboring institution. Nonetheless, certain economic matters have general applicability.

A Macroeconomic View

Providing higher education to more than 300,000 people is obviously a costly enterprise. Rough calculations prepared for the present report indicate that the total direct cost of educating foreign students—tuition, fees, living expenses, and incidentals—may be in the neighborhood of $2.5 billion annually. This figure does not include public and private subsidies which, though considerable, defy meaningful national aggregation (see "The 'Hidden Scholarships,'" later in this chapter, for a discussion).

Some of these direct costs are paid from U.S. sources. Many universities provide foreign graduate students with teaching and research assistantships; currently, about 30,000 foreign students hold such positions, though the annual number of awards has been steadily declining. Many more foreign students work on campus in libraries, cafeterias, and so forth. Because foreign students in the latter positions do not need permission from the Immigration and Naturalization Service in order to accept these kinds of work, no national record of numbers is kept. In recent years, an additional 30,000 foreign students each year have received INS permission to work off campus. Other

important U.S. sources of direct support include public and private scholarships: Some 5,000–6,000 foreign students receive scholarships from the U.S. federal government. At least 5,000 more are supported by private agencies such as foundations, church groups, and social service organizations.

Foreign sponsoring agencies play a much larger role than do U.S. sources in providing scholarship support to foreign students. Many countries now have large government scholarship schemes which annually sponsor several thousand students in the United States. Although the larger programs are in OPEC and middle-income developing countries, several less-well-off nations also have formal scholarship programs. Most of these scholarship arrangements are well managed, but occasionally logistical and political problems do impede the stable and regular transfer of funds.

The largest single source of foreign student support is probably family and personal funds, as shown by data from the Institute of International Education (see Appendix A, table 1) and by studies conducted in other countries (see "Economic Factors" in "Sources and References"). Although no precise figures are available on the total amount of foreign funds sent or brought into the United States to support the education of these private students, the money flow easily amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Problems may arise about sufficiency and dependability of funds: currency control regulations in the home country, the variability of exchange rates, and sometimes unrealistic cost-of-living estimates all impinge on the process.

Data on primary sources of support are informative, but contribute only partially to understanding how foreign students actually support themselves. Probably there are many patterns of support, but no data are available to show the number of students who supplement their stated primary source with additional revenue from, say, campus employment. Some students may rely on personal or family funds during their first year of study in compliance with the visa requirement, but in later years pursue other sources as they acquire increased sophistication in locating new resources or if they run short of funding.

While the combinations and patterns of support foreign students rely on are unknown, three generalizations can be assumed: First, the money coming from foreign sources to support foreign students is considerable; but second, the amount coming in cannot possibly meet total educational costs; and consequently third, U.S. sources somehow

must be tapped to make up the difference. Even if the IIE inference that over 80 percent of foreign student costs are paid by sources abroad (which does seem unrealistic) is accepted, that still leaves a 20 percent, or $500,000,000, shortfall. Moreover, other costs—public and private subsidies, and the costs of special services for foreign students—also must be considered. In short, American institutions of higher education are ill-advised to think of foreign students mainly in terms of economic gain. Instead, they should admit foreign students for the potential, less-tangible benefits that may be derived from them. They should, moreover, take special steps to make sure that those benefits, for which they are in part paying, are indeed realized.

Foreign Students and Institutional Economics

While the conclusion reached in the preceding paragraph applies to the aggregate national picture, in certain circumstances foreign students may be of some economic benefit to some institutions. Leaving aside, at this point, discussion of educational, cultural, and other intangible benefits, consider only the impact of foreign students on an institution's fiscal and organizational health.

Administrators in higher education share the aim of producing high-quality education, as measured by the caliber of graduates, for the least expenditure of resources. Those concerned with efficiency should consider the relationship between average and marginal costs. Average costs are defined as the educational unit's fixed expenditure plus current expenditure divided by the total number of students served. Marginal costs are determined by measuring the effect that adding or subtracting one more student would have on current expenditure and therefore on total costs. Where marginal costs are less than average costs, an increase in student numbers should result in reducing average costs, that is, improving the situation in an educational unit which is too small to produce graduates at the lowest cost per student. In the reverse situation, where marginal costs exceed average costs, the institution is overenrolled to the point that it cannot train its students to graduation at the lowest possible expenditure, and thus (from the standpoint of cost considerations alone) student numbers should be decreased. In summary, any institution or subunit within it that is concerned with efficiency should welcome qualified students—foreign or domestic—up to the point where the marginal costs for educating them meet the average cost of training one student, but not beyond.

Unfortunately, the concept of "marginal cost" has achieved undue

popularity among those who view foreign students as among a prospective body of "nontraditional" students who can offset the revenue losses anticipated from projected declines in the traditional domestic pool. At times, the notion of "cost" even drops from their arguments and what remains is a description that alleges financial benefit will be achieved as marginal costs reduce average costs to a minimum. As this argument goes, the total operating costs of a college or university are relatively fixed; that is, they represent costs that must be paid regardless of the number of enrollments. Therefore, any increase in income derived from the enrollment of foreign students can be seen as pure gain. Such presentations slight the consideration that marginal costs are real costs and become increasingly significant over the long run.

While not every educational institution could prudently recruit foreign students for efficiency's sake, there are circumstances that would favor such a course With the anticipated decline in the domestic student population, many a higher educational institution will face a situation in which fewer graduates will be produced and thereby the average cost of providing education will be increased. If an institution then increased the charges for its services, inefficiency would result and could be made even worse in a competitive market if that increase should cause a reduction in consumer demand.

An institution that suffers sharp declines in traditional enrollments either across the board or in certain subunits faces choices. The president and governing board could decide that the costs of keeping the troubled institution or subunit alive would exceed available or projected resources, or could decide that those costs simply would outweigh either short-term or long-term benefits, or both. The logical move in those circumstances is close down the institution or subunit in question. Should such a decision be prompted by an evaporation of available resources, as in the case of bankruptcy, then contractual obligations would cease or become so modified as to render considerable short-term savings. However, most institutional leaders would want to avoid terminating departments, let alone their institutions, and elect to explore carefully all other alternatives.

One option is to contract in some dimension, that is, to make a long-run shift in the basic scale of the institution. This action could result in a new optimal size at which the institution might again provide high-quality education at a lower average cost. But such an adjustment is not readily accomplished. There comes a point at which diminution of scale adversely affects the quality of an institution's educational program to

an intolerable degree, to a point where even its accreditation may be jeopardized. Even before that point is reached, public confidence in the institution might be so diminished as to bring about a further reduction in enrollment. Eventually the institution may be led to lower its admissions standards in order to increase enrollments, but that move would only contribute to a further erosion in quality. Furthermore, an institution considering contraction must grapple with the special nature of its facilities, which are not easily convertible to other uses. More important, the nature of an institution's contractual obligations to its tenured faculty offset the opportunity to achieve short-term savings. Most probably, institutional contraction would not yield significant benefits for at least a decade, owing to the time required to close down facilities and let faculty attrition take its course.

The prudent course for most institutions is to explore strategies that would preserve the existing plant size by making up for declines in enrollments, including the strategy of expanding the clientele beyond the 18–22-year-old domestic student. In theory, any student who can be attracted to an institution facing a decline in enrollments (and hence rising average costs at the existing scale of operations) should improve institutional efficiency as the additional, marginal cost of educating new students would be offset somewhat by a reduction in the average costs. But, when foreign students are regarded as a new potential clientele, they should be viewed primarily as a means for achieving temporary rather than permanent efficiency. While foreign student enrollments can help some institutions through the two difficult decades ahead, by the end of the century the expanded higher education systems of sending countries should be able to assume the task of educating the students they must now export. As a result, higher education planners need to give careful forethought to what their institutions would and should look like after the foreign student boom has passed, and to draw long-range institutional strategies accordingly.

The "Hidden Scholarships"

The preceding discussion suggests that foreign students are of optimal economic benefit to a particular type of institution: one that depends heavily on tuition or other forms of per capita revenue in order to meet the costs of academic instruction. Foreign students would be of less economic benefit to institutions that finance the costs of providing instruction through lump sums of tax money, endowments, gifts, and other sources that are not closely tied to enrollment. In fact, almost no

student—domestic or foreign—in U.S. higher education pays the full cost of his or her higher education. All students receive what some term a "hidden scholarship." Among institutions, it is only the extent of that "scholarship," or subsidy, that varies. Determining the distribution of that subsidy among the range of students enrolled—graduate and undergraduate, traditional and nontraditional, domestic and foreign—is an institutional decision made with an eye to improving the quality of the institution and of the society it seeks to serve. Colleges and universities regularly make decisions to help cover the added costs of providing educational services for particular domestic clients whom they hope to attract and hold. Just as regularly, colleges and universities have sought to be truly universal, that is, to be a part of an international community in which the search for, and the offering of, knowledge knows no geographical boundaries, and thus have taken steps to attract students and scholars from around the globe.

In the case of public institutions, student subsidies may become a political as well as an educational issue. As discussed in the preceding chapter, recently some state legislatures have attempted to raise the tuition charged foreign students who attend public educational institutions. These attempts have thus far been unsuccessful, but the fact that some policy makers even raise the issue is cause for comment.

The justification given for most of these legislative efforts is that foreign students are neither taxpayers nor dependents of taxpayers and thus do not contribute toward the maintenance costs of the institutions they attend. Higher charges are viewed as the only means of recovering these costs. Whether consciously or not, those who advocate special tuition rates usually are seeking recovery of the average, or "full," instructional costs. As shown in the British attempt to recover those costs from foreign students, it is extremely difficult to calculate average costs accurately and equitably. The formula applied in Britain simply is to divide state-supplied annual subsidies by the total number of students enrolled by field, level, and institution. But that method omits consideration of fixed expenditure, which is often difficult to compute. Defining full average costs for U.S. college and university programs would be still more difficult, as several sources of revenues besides tax subsidies are used to support public higher education. Given the difficulty with computing average costs, arbitrary surcharges for full cost recovery are devised.

In fact, practically all foreign students attending public institutions already pay a surcharge. They, like all others whose families are not residents of the given state, pay out-of-state rates. Even with the out-of-

state surcharge, however, no student currently pays the complete cost of his or her education; and increasing the surcharge in order to recover something approaching full recovery of average costs is an option available to those who set tuition rates. But if that surcharge is to be levied fairly, it should apply to all who are nonresidents: U.S. citizens from other states as well as foreign students. Decisions to impose increased tuition charges should be weighed carefully against issues of equity and discrimination and should not be made solely on the basis of political fashion and expediency.

Foreign Student Services

Any institution which admits foreign students should recognize that certain costs are incurred for essential services to that constituency, but are not required for domestic students. The extra costs may result from added administrative expenses or from direct services to the foreign students. Since the amount of the cost to an institution depends on the nature and extent of the services, how the cost is to be regarded becomes a matter of institutional policy. Generally, the monetary cost incurred through providing the special services is relatively modest in comparison to the educational disadvantages of doing without them.

The mix and the total cost of these additional services will vary considerably from institution to institution, as will the manner in which each college or university chooses to finance them. The vast majority of institutions pay for such support services from their central budgets. The expense is seen as a necessary and normal cost of dealing with a type of special student whose presence on campus is desired. Some institutions attempt to recover a measure of these extra costs by charging foreign students directly for the services. For example, it is quite common for institutions to seek full-cost recovery for an intensive English language program by charging appropriate fees to those enrolled. Many institutions establish higher application fees for prospective overseas students than for their domestic counterparts in order to defray the added costs to the admissions office. A few institutions experiencing budgetary difficulties have attempted to identify a reasonable cost figure reflecting the special services which can be passed on to the foreign student in the form of a special fee. While such fees have policy implications related to the poorer foreign student, on balance they seem preferable to eliminating essential foreign student services. Provided these fees are allocated directly to serve the interests of the students from whom they are collected, they should not be viewed with the same alarm as a differential tuition schedule.

FIVE

Foreign Student Trends and the Need for Policy

For good reason, education policy makers and planners are concerned less about what has happened over the past decade than about what could and ought to happen in the next one. Future trends can be described only as likely or possible, given the limited data on which to base projections. Yet some suggestions can be offered to higher education leaders about formulating policy for dealing with the future foreign student population.

Enrollment Projections

At present rates of increase, the foreign student population could reach half a million by 1985 and a million or more by the early 1990s. A continued rise of that magnitude could hardly go unnoticed for it would take place against the projected decline in domestic enrollments: foreign students could represent 5 percent of total enrollment by 1985 and climb toward 10 percent by the start of the next decade. As foreign students enroll on a full-time basis at rates far higher than do American students, even more striking would be the rise of foreign students as a proportion of full-time enrollments. In two-year institutions, the ratio of full-time foreign to full-time domestic students is currently one in 50; in 1985 it could be one in 25, and by the end of the decade, close to one in 12. In four-year institutions, the foreign-domestic full-time ratio is now a little over one in 30; in 1985 it could be close to one in 15, and by the start of the 1990s, one in ten. For graduate schools, the ratios are even more striking: now one to eight; by 1985, close to one in five; and by 1990, more than one in four. (See estimated enrollment patterns over the 1980s, based on current trends, Appendix A, tables 2 and 3.)

Should these projections prove accurate, the character of U.S. campus life would change dramatically over the next decade as foreign students come to represent a significant segment of the student body. Their effects on institutions could become even greater if foreign students, taking the cue from their domestic counterparts, become

assertive about placing responsibility on, and demanding accountability of, institutions for meeting their needs. Changes will be felt throughout the higher education establishment as foreign students, pressing beyond the absorption capacity of the larger institutions, increasingly apply for admission to a more diverse cross section of higher education.

There is no certainty, of course, that the foreign student population will continue to increase at rates approximating those of the past few years. Several factors—domestic and foreign—have the potential for affecting numbers. If the United States, for example, had summarily deported all Iranian students (as some impassioned voices once urged), that action would have reduced the foreign student population by one-fifth. Although that course of action was not taken, many other decisions affecting numbers have been made, such as the establishment or curtailment of various scholarship programs, both here and abroad. The future undoubtedly will contain many unpredictables that will affect foreign student numbers.

Ultimately, numbers are bound to decline when college and university systems in sending countries are developed sufficiently to accommodate students who until then must go abroad for higher education. Just when the decrease will begin is difficult to predict, particularly as the concomitant expansion of secondary education in most sending countries introduces a complicating factor. Expansion rates at the secondary level generally exceed those at the tertiary; thus the demand for higher education may for several years outpace its provision in many major sending countries. A fairly safe guess is that the need to study abroad will continue at least throughout the coming decade and may not begin to decline until the latter part of the 1990s.

Trends by Nationality

The national composition of tomorrow's foreign student population will be determined by a host of unpredictable factors, ranging from success in oil drilling operations to future diplomatic realignments. It is, nevertheless, possible to hazard some guesses about what might happen over the next decade and perhaps beyond. There is good reason to assume, for instance, that many countries which have traditionally sent large numbers of students to the United States will continue to do so. These would include such nations as Taiwan, Canada, Japan, Hong Kong, Thailand, and India. Also to be expected is the continued presence, and probable increases in numbers, of students from OPEC

countries, notably Nigeria, Venezuela, and Saudi Arabia. In the short run, while diplomatic relations with them remain strained, the formerly large numbers of students from such countries as Vietnam, Ethiopia, and possibly Cuba will diminish. A major enigma, of course, is what will happen to the Iranian student population.

For a short period after 1979, when tensions accelerated between the United States and Iran, the number of Iranian students here remained fairly constant at about 50,000. Indeed, in 1980 the number of students in higher education increased a bit as a result of Iranians already in the country who had earlier matriculated for secondary education. This population cannot remain static forever, since there are limits to the number of sequential degrees that students can earn. Although new Iranian students may still legally come into the country to replace departing ones, social and diplomatic barriers militate against any massive influx comparable to that of prior years. Barring any sudden change in diplomatic relationships, a rapid downward shift in the number of Iranian students may be expected over the next few years. Preliminary census data for 1980–81, gathered by the Institute of International Education, seems to affirm this supposition, as the number enrolled in colleges and universities that year declined by about 4,300 from the 1979–80 figure. Many of those Iranians, of course, are still in the country, exploring every means possible to stay here.

Other countries may well counterbalance the decline resulting from Iranian student departures from higher education, and perhaps exceed it. The largest potential increase may be in the numbers of students from the People's Republic of China. Though China currently has only some 3,000 students in the United States, some predict that number could rise easily to the tens of thousands within a very few years, and perhaps to upwards of 100,000 by the end of this century. Others predict a plateau substantially lower. Nonetheless, the number of Chinese students, it is generally agreed, will increase well above the present level. Mexico is another country with tremendous growth potential. Its improving relations with the United States, coupled with its oil wealth and desire to improve rapidly its technological base, might spur an increase in Mexican enrollments from the present 6,000 to four, five, or even six times that number. Other countries that undoubtedly will turn to the United States as never before are those associated with the British Commonwealth. Put off by the imposition of "full fees" schedules in the United Kingdom, they may be increasingly attracted to now less-expensive English-speaking America. To take one

example, it is estimated that the number of Malaysian students in the United States in 1979–80 (4,000) will rise to 16,000 by 1985. As this example serves to point out, the kinds of increases here described are not far off and will be felt over the next few years as well as beyond.

Unless steps are taken to yield a contrary result, the overall character of the future foreign student population is likely to be an exaggerated version of the present. As proportions of that population, foreign students from OPEC and other better-off middle-income states are likely to rise from their present 35 percent and 25 percent respectively. Also likely is a corresponding decrease in the proportion of students from the poorer developing nations, which now represent 20 percent of the total. In sum, as costs continually escalate, there is danger that the foreign student population may be drawn principally from those nations and classes that can afford to send students here. Surely, and as is done for the domestic population, attention should be paid to ensure that access to U.S. higher education is not restricted to the very rich. For equity's sake, there should be not only an increase in traditional forms of scholarship support through AID and other programs, but also an attempt to devise additional patterns of assistance. Perhaps, for example, the charter of the World Bank could be broadened to permit new loan programs to help poorer countries expand their scholarship efforts.

Projections by Discipline

The choices of discipline made by foreign students have exhibited discernible trends over the past twenty-five years, which may reasonably be expected to continue into the 1980s. On this basis, foreign students in engineering will continue to constitute around 25 percent of the total foreign student population; in education, around 5 percent; in fine and applied arts, about 5 percent; in the health professions, 3–4 percent; and in agriculture, 3 percent. Two fields are likely to experience growth: business and management, from its current 16 percent to perhaps 20 percent of total population by decade's end; and mathematics and computer sciences, from its present 5 percent of total to perhaps 7–8 percent by 1990. Over the past several years, the proportions of foreign students enrolling in other important fields have shown a steady decline which may continue into the near future. The percentage of total in the humanities has exhibited the sharpest decrease, from 15 percent of the total foreign student population in 1969–70, to only 4 percent in 1979–80. At recent rates of decline, the percentage in the

humanities would become only 2 percent in 1985 and a mere 1 percent in 1990. Similarly, the percentage in the natural and life sciences, now 8 percent of total, could be half that by 1985 and only 2 percent by 1990. Social science majors, now also around 8 percent of the total foreign student population, could be 5–6 percent by 1985 and only 3 percent by 1990.

These percentages should be interpreted in relation to the total foreign student population on which they are based. If foreign student numbers continue to double every five to six years over the next decade or so, declines in disciplinary percentages would not necessarily mean declines in absolute numbers. Conversely, increases in percentages based on an expanding population would mean considerably larger numbers of new students. Nonetheless, foreign students ought not to be considered as a facile solution to the problem of underenrolled fields and departments. The fields suffering the most severe declines—the arts, the humanities, and the social sciences—are not the fields of general foreign student interest. Rather, and except for doctoral programs in engineering, foreign students come here for education that is and will likely continue to be in high domestic demand.

These projections are certainly subject to considerable change. Some fields, particularly those of highest demand, are subject to limiting factors. The nation's schools simply cannot absorb all foreign applicants in every field, and plateaus may be reached. The projections also cannot take into account unpredictable fluctuations in the relative popularity of the several fields. Based on recent experience, though, certain assumptions are fairly safe: Foreign students at least over the near future will continue to come here primarily for education in the practical fields of technology and administration, and less to pursue the more traditional academic disciplines.

Predicted Levels of Study

The clear tendency over the past ten years has been toward a proportionate increase in foreign student enrollments at the undergraduate level, and there is no reason to expect that tendency will soon diminish. Over the past five years, undergraduate enrollments have been increasing at an average annual rate of approximately 15 percent per year. Increases in graduate school enrollments have been on the order of 10 percent per year. Currently, two foreign students are enrolled at the undergraduate level for every one at the graduate level. If recent trends

continue, the ratio of undergraduate to graduate may become three to one by mid-decade.

Eventually, this tendency is bound to reverse itself as higher education systems in home countries become sufficiently developed to educate their own undergraduate student populations. The situation is different, however, for graduate education. The cost of building and maintaining graduate facilities is much higher than for undergraduate institutions, and a long lead time is required to train members of graduate faculties. Thus many countries will continue to find it more expedient and cost-effective to send their advanced students to such countries as the United States for graduate training, particularly in the fields of high technology. While over the next decade or so it may be expected that foreign students will continue to come here mostly for undergraduate training, the proportion at the graduate level will eventually begin to rise once again. Graduate schools in the United States will remain an important educational resource for foreign students well into the twenty-first century

Because graduate education for foreign students is a matter of long-range importance, careful thought must go to its purpose and results. Particular concerns have been voiced about educating foreign students in the fields of advanced technology for the reason, some allege, that the knowledge gained here will eventually fuel the engines of our corporate competitors abroad. Foreign students, so one argument goes, have infiltrated America's graduate schools of technology to the point that almost half the doctorates in engineering now go to them. The statement is true, but with the irony that the annual number of doctorates in engineering awarded to foreign students has diminished over the past five years: from 3,000 to 2,500. The proportion has increased because the number of domestic students pursuing the doctorate in engineering has declined precipitously, largely because industry offers engineers with bachelor's and master's degrees such high salaries that fewer and fewer are attracted to doctoral study. The failure of this nation to pass on to the next generation high-level training in engineering is a national crisis that jeopardizes America's future technological development. The problem, however, is of U.S. making, not the foreign student's. Foreign students in doctoral programs in engineering, far from siphoning off American technological know-how, in fact assist in preserving this nation's resources against the day when domestic students reenter the study of high technology, and the nation reasserts its scientific and technological leadership.

The Need for Policy

The projections about foreign student enrollments described above are based on the assumption that U.S. higher education will continue to respond to foreign student demand as it has in the past. The presumption may be inaccurate. Higher education may find itself unable or unwilling to accommodate vastly increasing numbers of foreign students, and the United States may, as other countries have done, begin to put limits on admissions. Unlike other leading host countries, the United States has no central, national mechanism which can—or indeed should—exercise that kind of control. To be sure, action could take place on the level of state government, an important matter that calls for careful monitoring. But recent experience indicates that, despite occasional aberrations, the general policy in state legislatures has been to allow public colleges and universities to deal with foreign applicants within the broad scope of whatever policies govern all out-of-state admissions. Ultimately, then, this nation's posture toward foreign students is going to be the aggregate of actions taken by the several state systems of higher education and the individual institutions. Given the potential increase in foreign applicants, it is imperative that the governing bodies of those systems and institutions, if they have not done so already, address what they will do with respect to foreign students and develop appropriate policies and procedures.

Several guides for framing and implementing foreign student policy are available (two are excerpted in Appendix B), and thus the present report need not detail the elements of an effective policy. Six important considerations, however, need to be borne in mind as policy is developed. First, policy toward foreign students should be developed within the context of, and be directly related to, the institution's basic educational mission. Second, all segments of the academic community, especially the faculty, should be involved in development of policy; and, given the profound effects that foreign students could have on the educational programs of many institutions, that policy should be reviewed and endorsed by the governing board. Third, there must be adequate institutional support, moral and material, to ensure that whatever is decided can be carried out effectively. Fourth, the institution should demonstrate its adherence to certain minimal codes of professional and ethical behavior with respect to the recruitment, admission, and treatment of foreign students. Fifth, policy makers should consider ways to improve and promote integration of foreign students into the entire student body in order to enhance the educa-

tional experiences for both foreign and domestic students. And sixth, the development of policy should be seen as but the first step in what should be a continuing commitment to institutional self-study and self-evaluation with respect to the foreign student program.

One way to begin the policy development process is to appoint a system- or campus-wide committee to draft for board consideration a proposed statement of the institution's policy concerning foreign students. The committee membership should include persons who have direct responsibility for dealing with foreign student matters, but by no means be limited to that group. The committee could include as well faculty members from schools and departments with actual or predicted heavy enrollments of foreign students; persons from the student housing office, the student union, and the catering services; representatives of the business office; students, domestic and foreign; and scholars and others with particular expertise or interest in the geographic areas from which the foreign students are drawn. Also important is representation on the committee from the office of the chief executive officer.

As a first step, the committee should examine the institution's basic educational mission and the place of international education therein, since foreign student programs will be conducted within that context. This undertaking assumes that each state system or institution has a coherent view of its various international activities. But at many colleges and universities, international activities are conducted with little thought given to coherence and sometimes represent less an institutional commitment than the sum of discrete—and sometimes competing—individual or departmental interests. International objectives therefore must be clarified before considering how foreign students figure into the institution's international, and thus basic, mission.

Any committee drafting policy will necessarily address special services for foreign students and make recommendations about acceptable levels of performance and support. Funding realities will inevitably limit what institutions can, as opposed to what they would like to, provide in foreign student services. These services, like all other campus programs, are subject to budgetary review, but they ought to be seen as an essential ingredient in the success of any foreign student program. Specifically, no institution that accepts foreign students should be without some office or officer specifically responsible for looking after the interests of foreign students. And, given the rising importance of foreign students on campuses, that office or officer should have a stronger channel of communication with the president's

office than most institutions provide. As an ironic note, some institutions, in twin responses to budgetary pressures, have cut back their foreign student advisors offices at the same time they increase their efforts to recruit students from abroad.

Growing economic pressures may tempt some institutions into compromising on standards and indulging in unprofessional behavior. As described earlier in this report, instances of questionable—and in some cases illegal—action have tarnished the reputation of U.S. higher education. In an effort to stem such behavior, codes of professional and ethical practice have recently been drawn up, perhaps the best known being the so-called Wingspread Principles (excerpted in Appendix B). The message in the codes is clear: institutions should tell the truth about themselves in making representations to prospective overseas applicants; apply the same admissions standards to foreign students as to domestic students; obey the law with respect to admission and reporting procedures; and live up to the student's rightful expectation to receive here a quality educational experience. Few colleges or universities would in more halcyon days ever dream of besmirching their reputations by violating these principles. In the times of adversity ahead, institutions will need not only to redouble their efforts to ensure continuing adherence to the principles, but also to indicate to the outside world that they are committed to upholding them. Thus, those responsible for deciding institutional policy with respect to foreign students might well recommend that the college or university adopt a statement indicating commitment to maintaining standards of professional and ethical behavior.

Beyond meeting standards, policy makers should be concerned about deriving maximum benefit from having foreign students in their institutions. This goal hinges on successfully integrating foreign students into the mainstream of campus life. It is becoming less and less acceptable—if indeed it ever was—for foreign students to be treated as a subgroup to be looked after by specialized administrators or, worse, as people who must fend for themselves in an alien environment. On many campuses today, unfortunately, foreign students interact socially much more with their compatriots than with U.S. students, and the situation has often, in effect, become institutionalized through living arrangements in which foreign students, particularly fellow nationals, are housed together. In extreme instances, campus administrators have become alarmed lest legal problems loom because, from another perspective, foreign student enclaves may appear to be manifestations

of racial segregation. For certain kinds of foreign students, particularly those who come for short-term special training programs, such groupings may have some merit. But for most foreign students, especially those here for long periods in regular academic programs, these enclaves are far less desirable and, indeed, are testimony that the U.S. campus environment may not afford a receptive social environment. Everyone loses as a result: our own nationals, who miss an opportunity to know people from other cultures; and foreign students, who while here may gain skills but understand national life more as portrayed on television than as acquired from personal associations.

Administrators have some limited power to ensure opportunity for fuller integration of foreign students into campus life, such as through the adjustment of housing patterns. But whether complete academic integration will be achieved ultimately is determined by the faculty. When faculty interest has sparked, leading to curriculum adaptation, fresh approaches to research, and scholarly exchange, then the campus becomes international-minded and thus a receptive environment for foreign students. Any incentives or inspirations to faculty which promote international-mindedness on campus may not appear as effective as central plans, but their effects will be much more deeply rooted.

On the other hand, institutions that recruit foreign students without considering how faculty members might greet their presence may encounter some unpleasantness. If faculty members are presented with foreign students who are deficient in English or whose credentials have been misjudged, they will react negatively. If they find that teaching a growing number of foreign students begins to consume disproportionate amounts of time, their reaction will be obvious. Clearly, a faculty that is resentful of having to teach foreign students is hardly one conducive to creating a receptive environment for them. Thus, those concerned with policy ought to take into account the just concerns of faculty members and ensure their participation both in the formulation of policy and in every step of its implementation.

The end product of an institution's efforts to define its foreign student policy, the statement itself, is actually of less importance than the process used to develop it: In thinking through various rationales and options, the institution undergoes an enlightening period of self-study analogous to the valuable learning experience encountered in an accreditation review. The process should, therefore, enable the institution to heighten awareness with respect to its goals and how it seeks to

achieve them, and that consciousness-raising process ought not to end once the policy statement is prepared. Indeed, preparation of the policy statement should be viewed as the inauguration of a continuing process of self-study and self-renewal. For that reason, institutional leaders should encourage keeping open the lines of communication established at the time the committee began its work in order to monitor the institution's adherence to established policy and permit orderly modifications as warranted.

Indeed, institutions should consider whether they might join other institutions in participating in a voluntary program of self-regulation. Already, for example, members of the Ohio College Association have agreed on a common set of institutional principles for foreign student recruitment and services, and have established a mechanism for monitoring the institutions' adherence. Other proposals suggest that the regional and professional school accreditation boards might become involved in judging the adequacy of institutions' procedures and provisions for foreign students. And the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, following consultation with the Office of Self-Regulation of the American Council on Education, is about to launch a national effort to promote self-regulation. It has already devised a "Statement of Principles" for responsible action (excerpted in Appendix B) and intends to use the statement as the basis for an ongoing program of cyclical review. Participation in such programs should be seen as a means both to ensure that codes of professional and ethical behavior are being obeyed and to improve the quality of foreign student programs.

The final decision about how to proceed in framing and implementing policy is up to each college, university, and state system. Approached intelligently, the future foreign student population can pay inestimable benefits to this nation and the global neighborhood in which it resides. Higher education's leadership can and should take positive action.

APPENDIX A

Statistics on Foreign Students in the United States

TABLE 1

Proportions of Foreign Students by Primary Source of Funds, 1979-80

Primary Source of Funds Reported	Percentage of All Foreign Students
Personal and family	65.4
Home government	13.0
College or university	9.2
Foreign private sponsor	3.0
Employment	2.7
U.S. government	2.0
U.S. private sponsor	1.9
Other	2.8
Total	100.0

SOURCE: Institute of International Education, *Open Doors: 1979/80: Report on International Educational Exchange* (New York: IIE, 1981), p. 26.

TABLE 2

Total Enrollments and Foreign Student Enrollments in U.S. Higher Education, 1979-80, with Projected Proportions, 1980-81—1988-89

Academic Year	Estimated Total Enrollment in Thousands	Estimated Foreign Enrollment	
		In Thousands	Percentage
1979–80	11,569	286	2.5
1980–81	11,940	324	2.7
1981–82	11,831	367	3.1
1982–83	11,722	415	3.5
1983–84	11,613	470	4.0
1984–85	11,492	532	4.6
1985–86	11,358	602	5.3
1986–87	11,215	681	6.1
1987–88	11,104	771	6.9
1988–89	11,048	804	7.2

SOURCES: 1. Total enrollments are from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, *The Condition of Education: Statistical Report, 1981 Edition* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1981), p. 142. Figures for 1979–80 and 1980–81 are actual; for the remaining years, estimates.

2. Foreign student enrollment and percentage for 1979–80 are from IIE, *Open Doors: 1979/80*, p. 2. The projections thereafter were derived by using the 1979–80 foreign enrollment figure and multiplying it and subsequent-year projections by the average rate of increase reported by IIE for 1979–80 and the preceding four academic years: 1975–76, 16.0 percent; 1976–77, 13.2 percent; 1977–78, 16.0 percent; 1978–79, 12.1 percent; 1979–80, 8.5 percent; *average of increases*, 13.2 percent.

(Notes for table 3)

SOURCES: 1. NCES, *The Condition of Education: 1981 Edition*, p. 142. Figures for 1979–80 and 1980–81 are actual; for the remaining years, estimates.

2. IIE, *Open Doors: 1979/80*, pp. 20–21, with adjustments to those figures to account for estimated full-time enrollment only.

* *Open Doors* statistics on enrollment trends by level for recent years are confusing owing to changes in reporting format. A reasonable guess is that enrollments in two-year institutions have recently been increasing by 20 percent per year; in four-year undergraduate, by 15 percent per year; and at the graduate level, by 10 percent per year. These rates are reflected in the projected increases. Moreover, estimates also take into account that, in recent years, the numbers of foreign students in full-time study have been on the order of 85 percent at two-year institutions and 90 percent at four-year institutions and at the graduate level. The projections assume these proportions apply.

TABLE 3

Projections of Full-time Total and Foreign Student Enrollments, and Estimates of Foreign Student Proportion, 1979-80—1988-89

Academic Year	Estimated Full-Time Enrollment		
	Total in Thousands	Foreign Students	
		In Thousands*	Percentage
	Two-Year Institutions		
1979–80	1,591	30	1.9
1980–81	1,718	35	2.0
1981–82	1,727	41	2.4
1982–83	1,737	48	2.8
1983–84	1,747	57	3.3
1984–85	1,718	66	3.8
1985–86	1,689	77	4.6
1986–87	1,667	90	5.4
1987–88	1,655	105	6.3
1988–89	1,661	123	7.4
	Four-Year Undergraduate Institutions		
1979–80	4,488	123	2.7
1980–81	4,653	139	3.0
1981–82	4,523	158	3.5
1982–83	4,395	179	4.1
1983–84	4,263	203	4.8
1984–85	4,159	230	5.5
1985–86	4,048	262	6.5
1986–87	3,934	297	7.5
1987–88	3,857	338	8.8
1988–89	3,823	384	10.0
	Graduate Level		
1979–80	715	85	11.9
1980–81	739	93	12.6
1981–82	734	101	13.8
1982–83	728	110	15.1
1983–84	722	120	16.6
1984–85	724	131	18.1
1985–86	723	143	19.8
1986–87	720	156	21.7
1987–88	713	170	23.8
1988–89	701	185	26.4

For notes, see preceding page.

APPENDIX B

Two Statements on Foreign Student Policies

The Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy has not been alone in grappling with problems presented by the recruitment and enrollment of foreign students. Among the many recent statements produced by various associations and organizations, two are excerpted here. The first is a statement from *Foreign Student Recruitment*, prepared under the auspices of the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions, on recruitment practices in U.S. colleges and universities. These "Wingspread Principles" (so called from the name of the Johnson Foundation's conference center, where they were formulated in 1980) address the abuses likely to occur when recruitment is made subservient to selfish interest, and point to the necessity for ethical behavior in future endeavors. The second excerpt is from *NAFSA Principles for International Educational Exchange*, drawn up by the Task Force on Standards and Responsibilities, established by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. The *Principles*, NAFSA hopes, will form the basis for a continuing process of institutional self-study and self-regulation.

The "Wingspread Principles"

Source: National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions, *Foreign Student Recruitment: Realities and Recommendations*, ed. Hugh M. Jenkins (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980), pp. 56–57.

Noting that this colloquium has brought together a wide representation including college presidents, university administrators, institutional and associational representatives, and members of government agencies, we believe it important to identify those abuses in the recruitment of foreign students which are of common concern. We consider them detrimental to the welfare of foreign students and to the reputation of higher education in the United States.

1. The use of placement agencies that charge institutions a per capita fee.

2. The recruitment of foreign students without prior consideration of and commitment to providing necessary campus services.

3. Failure to represent the institution properly in advertising, publications, informative materials, personal interviews, etc.

4. The use of inadequately trained foreign admissions officers.

5. The improper delegation of admissions authority.

6. The misuse of immigration forms with regard to a student's academic qualifications, English language proficiency, and financial resources.

7. The practice of granting admission to English language programs to foreign students who are college bound, without regard to their academic qualifications.

8. The practice of granting foreign students admission to English language programs that do not qualify as full-time intensive programs and are therefore not in compliance with Immigration and Naturalization Service regulations.

9. The practice of promising and/or implying that admission to intensive English language programs constitutes admission to an academic degree program.

Criteria for Ethical Recruitment. To eliminate the abuses cited, institutions that recruit foreign students should:

1. Provide enough candid and pertinent information that a foreign student unfamiliar with United States practices in higher education may make informed academic judgments.

2. Avoid contractual arrangements with agents who require fee-for-enrollment payments.

3. Develop an admissions policy for foreign students which
   —requires that admissions judgments be made by institutional personnel who rule on other admissions,
   —is based on a system of written criteria, and
   —is applied in competition with other applicants.

4. Seek a match between the needs and aspirations of the prospective student and the educational opportunities the institution affords.

5. Accept the commitment to provide effective educational opportunity for foreign students and establish appropriate institutional policies governing foreign student recruitment, admissions, support activities, specialized programs, and curricula.

6. Provide realistic estimates of costs for tuition, educational expenses, subsistence, and related fees and of the extent to which financial aid or scholarships are available to foreign students.

7. Restrict evaluation of foreign academic records to personnel who are trained and competent in interpretation of foreign educational records.

8. State clearly to students admitted to English language programs the extent of commitment made for their further education in the United States.

"Principles for Institutions"

Source: NAFSA Principles for International Educational Exchange, duplicated (Washington: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1981), p. 4.

. . . Programs of international educational exchange take many forms and are located in institutions of divergent purposes, sizes, and settings. Regardless of form and content the value of any program can be realized only when a college or university has made a conscious decision to be involved in international educational exchange and has made a commitment of resources commensurate with the nature and scope of that exchange. Such recognition and commitment require adherence to the following institution-wide principles:

1. The institution should have a clearly stated policy, endorsed by the governing board, setting forth the goals and objectives of the international educational program or programs developed by the institution. This policy should be manifest in the institution's planning and budgeting. Personnel and program resources—administrative and academic—should be sufficient to assure that the program can be operated in ways consistent with the principles presented in this document.

2. The executive staff of the institution should discuss with the faculty and administrative staff the implications of the international exchange policy for the academic programs and academic staff.

3. Programs in international educational exchange should be closely related to and consistent with the basic purposes and strengths of the institution.

4. Regardless of program size, the institution should acknowledge its responsibility to demonstrate sensitivity to cultural needs—social, religious, dietary, and housing. These factors must be accounted for in the planning and execution of the program.

5. Special services required by involvement in international education should be performed by personnel who are trained for their particular responsibilities, and institutional policy should ensure that faculty and administrative staff receive appropriate training for the activities they manage.

6. Administrative staff and faculty should seek to develop and maintain respect and sensitivity toward those from different cultures in the execution of their responsibilities for international educational exchange programs.

7. The institution should periodically evaluate programs, policies, and services, in light of established goals, and regularly review those goals.

APPENDIX C

Resources for Managing Foreign Student Programs

Colleges and universities that seek to establish or improve their foreign student programs have at their disposal many resources to assist their efforts. These include public and private organizations and agencies which provide programs, publications, and services of direct benefit to any institution embarking on or engaged in recruitment and enrollment of foreign students.

Organizations with Overall Interests

The professional association that carries principal responsibility for looking into all matters relating to foreign students is the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). (Addresses and telephone numbers for this and other associations mentioned are listed at the end of this appendix.) NAFSA has both individual and institutional members. Founded in 1948, NAFSA regularly publishes and updates guidelines and statements of standards for dealing with foreign students, conducts programs of professional development for its membership, and advises institutions that seek to improve the quality of their foreign student services. On some matters, such as those concerned with the interpretation and implementation of official regulations or those connected with the payment of student fees by overseas agencies, NAFSA has taken an active role in intervening with agencies of government, at home and abroad, in the resolution of issues.

Another organization with a special interest in foreign students is the Institute of International Education (IIE). Founded in 1919, this nonprofit organization's mandate is to work toward the improvement of international education by sponsoring exchanges, conducting research, holding seminars and conferences, producing publications, and so forth. Its headquarters are in New York City, and it has regional offices in Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Houston, and San Francisco, as well as overseas offices in Hong Kong, Bangkok, and Mexico City. It

administers the Fulbright and other programs of student exchange. It is equally well known for its annual surveys of the foreign student population, the results of which have been published yearly since 1955 in *Open Doors* and are this country's best available census data on foreign students.

Several organizations which focus primarily on domestic higher educational concerns also have a related interest in foreign students matters. One is the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). Over the past several years, it has published profiles of the educational systems in other countries to assist admissions officers in assessing what the differing credentials from a wide range of applicants actually represent. The College Board operates an International Education Office, which advises on admissions matters, and the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) has a Committee on International Education whose special interest is in the graduate education of foreign students.

These five organizations—NAFSA, IIE, AACRAO, the College Board, and CGS—together form the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (NLC), which meets regularly to discuss current issues. NCL also issues reports on special topics and most recently was in the news for its cosponsorship, with the Johnson Foundation, of the 1980 conference that resulted in the "Wingspread Principles" of foreign student recruitment (see Appendix B). Three of these organizations—NAFSA, IIE, and AACRAO—have joined with the U.S. government agency that funds many data-gathering efforts, the International Communication Agency (ICA), to form the Interassociational Committee on Data Collection, which assists IIE's data collection efforts.

Organizations with Area or National Interests

In addition to these several organizations which deal with matters affecting the total foreign student population, a number of others work with students from particular geographical areas. One that serves exclusively students from Africa is the African-American Institute (AAI). It conducts several scholarship programs for African students coming to American colleges and universities, perhaps the best known of which is the African Graduate Fellowship Program of American Universities (AFGRAD). Serving students from the Middle East is American-Mideast Educational and Training Services, Inc. (AMIDEAST). It, too, conducts several scholarship programs and

maintains overseas offices in certain Middle East countries. Serving the Western Hemisphere is the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU), which is an association of 400 higher educational institutions in the United States, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The purpose of LASPAU is to improve the academic strengths of Latin American and Caribbean universities by providing graduate education opportunities in the United States for their faculty members.

Certain kinds of fellowships for Asians are administered by the Asia Foundation, and the American-Scandanavian Foundation, in turn, offers some awards for students from Scandanavian countries coming to study in the United States. Student and other exchanges with the People's Republic of China are monitored by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (CSCPRC), which was established in the 1960s by the National Research Council, the Social Science Research Council, and the American Council of Learned Societies. In 1979, and with ICA support, CSCPRC in cooperation with NAFSA established a special clearinghouse for information on Chinese exchanges, but with the termination of that support the clearinghouse will have ceased to exist by the time this report is published. NAFSA, though, will continue to disseminate information on Chinese exchanges thereafter. Though differences mark these several programs and organizations, each has—either through overseas offices, representatives, or connections—developed networks that may be of assistance in understanding conditions and developments abroad.

While these programs and organizations are supported by a mixture of private and public resources, overseas as well as domestic, a good many are supported under the terms of Fulbright, AID, or other federal legislation. In addition to the well-known Fulbright student exchange program administered by IIE, Fulbright legislation also authorizes ICA to support many other exchange programs (such as LASPAU). ICA also can assist institutions in getting promotional materials abroad to its overseas posts. Reasonable quantities of an institution's brochures specially prepared for foreign student recruitment (but not regular catalogues and other heavier materials) can, for this purpose, be forwarded to ICA's Office of Student and Academic Support Services. Similarly, while AID does have its own Office of International Training which either directly places and supports trainees on campus, or more commonly contracts with other agencies to

do so, it supports some privately administered exchange initiatives (such as AFGRAD) as well. Another important service rendered by AID is the support for studies, seminars, and publications which, though specifically aimed at improving the educational experience of its own students, have relevance to the experiences of nonsponsored foreign students as well.

Special Kinds of Assistance

Several agencies can be of assistance to institutions carrying on foreign student programs. Specifically, resources exist for help in the following areas.

Recruitment. Institutions would do well to acquaint themselves with the report issued by the NLC, *Foreign Student Recruitment: Realities and Recommendations* (1980; available from the College Board) which includes the "Wingspread Principles" and the background for their development. Some organizations, such as IIE, AAI, and AMIDEAST, can assist institutions by having their overseas representatives interview candidates. Through special arrangements, these organizations might even arrange schedules for visiting campus recruiters. For institutions that elect to employ the services of independent overseas recruiters, NAFSA plans shortly to establish a clearinghouse of information about various recruiters, with the aim of sorting out the legitimate from the bogus.

General assistance in admissions policies and procedures. Among the several general admissions guides, the best is the brief NAFSA *Selection and Admission of Foreign Students* (1978). It details what is involved in the admissions process, points to areas of possible difficulty, and provides sample forms which colleges and universities may wish to replicate. Another excellent NAFSA pamphlet is its *Faculty Member's Guide to U.S. Immigration Law* (1980), which describes the several legal obligations incurred by institutions of which faculty members should be aware. Through its Field Services Program, NAFSA can also provide institutions, free of charge, with consultants who can assist them in devising appropriate admissions policies and procedures.

Credential evaluation. Of interest particularly to smaller institutions is the National Credentials Evaluation Project of the NLC. Through the use of volunteers, this service provides credential evaluations free of

charge to degree-granting institutions that enroll fifty or fewer foreign students and have limited experience in evaluating foreign certificates. Information about it can be obtained from NAFSA. Several other organizations evaluate credentials for a fee. These are listed in the IIE's *Evaluating Foreign Student Credentials* (1981). For institutions and persons wishing to increase their own expertise, several helpful publications are described in the same IIE publication.

English language proficiency. Several tests of English language competence of nonnative speakers are available, as are guidelines for the interpretation of test scores. A summary of the several resources is contained in NAFSA's *Guidelines: English Language Proficiency* (1977), which includes as well a list of considerations for those institutions that choose to conduct intensive English language programs. As most colleges and universities opt to use the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) administered by the Educational Testing Service, they should be familiar with the *Manual for TOEFL Score Recipients*, available from the Institutional Services Department of ETS.

Student services. NAFSA's *Guidelines: Initial Orientation of Foreign Students* (1975), *Guidelines: Academic and Personal Advising* (1975), and *Standards and Responsibilities: International Educational Interchange* (1979) provide advice to institutions seeking to establish and maintain adequate levels of student support services. NAFSA also provides, through its Field Services Program, several other mechanisms to improve support services ranging from free consultations to in-service training of professional and volunteer workers. Of future utility will be the NAFSA-sponsored Self-Regulation Program which, when launched, will include further programs of professional development, self-study, peer review and recognition, and complaint referral. Those interested in participating in this program should initially review *NAFSA Principles for International Educational Exchange* (1981; excerpted in Appendix B), on which the Self-Regulation Program will be based.

Enhancing the foreign student experience. In order to encourage experimentation with ways in which to enhance the foreign student experience on campus, NAFSA, through its Cooperative Projects Program which is funded by ICA, has a grant program to assist in the development of special projects. It also publishes guides aimed at developing foreign students as a learning resource, for example, Josef

A. Mestenhauser and Dietmar Barsig, *Foreign Students as Teachers: Learning with Foreign Students* (1978). In cooperation with AID, it has also conducted several seminars and projects aimed at improving the relevance of U.S. training to the needs of students from developing countries. See, for example, *The Relevance of U.S. Education to Students from Developing Countries* (1980) and *Needs of Foreign Students from Developing Nations at U.S. Colleges and Universities* (1981). The CGS also has cooperated in the production of NAFSA's survey report *The Relevance of U.S. Graduate Programs to Foreign Students from Developing Countries* (1979). The particular needs and concerns of foreign students in graduate education are further discussed in CGS's *The Foreign Student in American Graduate Schools* (1981).

In short, and as this brief review indicates, any college or university new to, or wishing to improve its programs for, foreign students has ample resources beyond the campus which can be of assistance.

Directory of Agencies and Organizations Cited

African-American Institute (AAI)
833 United Nations Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017
(212) 949-5666

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-9161

American-Mideast Educational and Testing Services, Inc. (AMIDEAST)
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 797-7900

American-Scandanavian Foundation
127 East 73rd St.
New York, N.Y. 10021
(212) 879-9779

Asia Foundation
550 Kearny St.
San Francisco, Calif. 94108
(415) 982-4640

College Board
International Education Office
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 332-1480

Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (CSCPRC)
2101 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418
(202) 389-6795

Council of Graduate Schools (CGS)
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 223-3791

Educational Testing Service (ETS)
Institutional Services Dept.
Princeton, N.J. 08540
(609) 921-9000

Institute of International Education (IIE)
809 United Nations Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017
(212) 833-8200

Interassociational Committee on Data Collection
c/o either Institute of International Education or National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU)
Room 302, 25 Mt. Auburn St.
Cambridge, Mass. 02138
(617) 495-5255

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA)
1860 19th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 462-4811

National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (NLC)
c/o National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

U.S. Agency for International Development (AID)
Office of International Training (ST/IT)
Division of Support Services
Washington, D.C. 20533
(703) 235-1984

U.S. International Communication Agency (ICA)
Associate Directorate for Educational and Cultural Affairs
Office of Student and Academic Support Services
1750 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20547
(202) 724-9943

Sources and References

Statistics on Foreign Students in the United States

Unless otherwise noted, the numerical data on foreign students in the United States contained in chapter one, which also form the bases for projections in chapter five, are from the Institute of International Education (IIE), *Open Doors, 1979/80: Report on International Educational Exchange* (New York: IIE, 1981). Specifically, the material on overall enrollments is from *Open Doors*, pp. 1–2; national origins of foreign students, pp. 3–12; locations of foreign students in the United States, pp. 29–38; institutions they attend, pp. 39–45, 49, and 52–55; and fields and levels of study, pp. 13–21. Additional statistics (but only for selected graduate-level enrollments) are to be found in: National Science Foundation, *Academic Science: Graduate Enrollment and Support, Fall, 1979* (Washington: NSF, 1980), pp. 19–20; and National Research Council, *Summary Report, 1980: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities* (Washington: NRC, 1981). These last two sources illustrate the concentration of foreign students in graduate programs in engineering, which is discussed in chapter five.

Personal Characteristics of Foreign Students

In chapter one, the discussion of personal characteristics is derived from: David C. Neice and Peter H. Braun, *A Patron for the World? A Descriptive Report of the CBIE Survey of Foreign Students in Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada, 1977*, 2 vols. (Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education, 1977), 1:36–47 (quotation from p. 36); Mark Blaugh and Maureen Woodhall, "A Survey of Overseas Students in British Higher Education," in *The Overseas Student Question: Studies for a Policy*, ed. Peter Williams (London: Heinemann, 1981), pp. 239–63 (quotation from p. 242); and (for the report of the European Cultural Foundation's Institute of Education), Alan Smith, Christine de Panafieu, and Jean-Pierre Jarousse, "Foreign Student Flows and Policies in an International Perspective," in *Overseas Student Question*, ed. Williams, pp. 165–222 (esp. pp. 218–20).

Further information on foreign student characteristics is contained in Philip H. Coombs, *Future Critical Issues in Education: A Provisional Report on Findings* (Essex, Conn.: International Council for Educational Develop-

ment, 1981), pp. 63–66. Several studies deal with the problems of foreign student adjustment mentioned in chapter five. Two recent ones are: W. Frank Hull, *Foreign Students in the United States of America: Coping Behavior within the Educational Environment* (New York: Praeger, 1978); and Otto Klineberg and W. Frank Hull, *At a Foreign University: An International Study of Adaptation and Coping* (New York: Praeger, 1979). An excellent (though dated) guide to the literature on foreign students' backgrounds, personalities, adjustment problems, etc., is Seth Spaulding and Michael J. Flack, *The World's Students in the United States: A Review and Evaluation of Research on Foreign Students* (New York: Praeger, 1976).

Foreign Students Overseas

The information contained in chapter two is derived from a number of sources. Figures on total global enrollments of foreign students are based on: G. Carcales, "The Development of Education in the World: A Summary Statistical Review," *International Review of Education*, 2/3 (1979): 147–76, esp. pp. 151–52; and UNESCO, *Statistical Yearbook, 1979/80* (Paris: Unesco, 1980). The descriptions of the situations in France, the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany draw heavily on the material presented in Alan Smith, Christine de Panafieu, and Jean-Pierre Jarousse, "Foreign Student Flows in an International Perspective," in *The Overseas Student Question: Studies for a Policy*, ed. Peter Williams (London: Heinemann, 1981), pp. 165–222. In addition, material on France is derived from Jacques Imbert, "Les étudiants étrangers en France," mimeographed (Paris: Centre des Oeuvres Universitaries et Scholaries, 1980), a report prepared for the Franco-German Colloquium on the Work of Universities, Caen, France, September 1–6, 1980. Material on the United Kingdom is also drawn from Peter Williams, "Overseas Students in Britain: The Background," in *Overseas Student Question*, ed. Williams, pp. 22–24; and the London Conference on Overseas Students, et al., *Overseas Students: A Subsidy to Britain* (London: London Conference on Overseas Students, September 1979).

Material on Canada comes from Max von Zur-Muehlen, "Foreign Students' Patterns in Canadian Universities in 1980," mimeographed (Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education); CBIE, "Foreign Student Policies in Canadian Universities and Colleges," mimeographed (Ottawa: CBIE, January 1981); "Quebec Foreign Students Face Massive Increase in Fees," *Communications* [journal of CBIE], March 1981, pp. 1–2; David C. Neice and Peter H. Braun, *A Patron for the World? A Descriptive Report of the CBIE Survey of Foreign Students at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada, 1977*, 2 vols. (Ottawa: CBIE, 1977); and CBIE, *A Question of Self-Interest: A Statement on Foreign Students in Canada* (Ottawa: CBIE, 1977).

The source of statistics on enrollments of Third World students in the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries is National Foreign Assess-

ments Center, Central Intelligence Agency, *Communist Aid Activities in Non-Communist Less-Developed Countries, 1979, and 1954–79: A Research Paper* (Washington: NFAC/CIA, October 1980), pp. 9, 11, 21–22.

Official Policy Toward Foreign Students

Citations of federal legislation cited in chapter three and sections of the legislation quoted there are as follows: Immigration and Nationality Act, P.L. 82-414 (U.S.C., 1101 *et seq.*), § 101 (a) (15) (F) (i); United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, P.L. 80-402 (22 U.S.C. 1431–1479), § 2; Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, P.L. 87-256 (22 U.S.C. 2451–2458), § 101; Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, P.L. 87-195 (22 U.S.C. 2151 *et seq.*), § 211 (a); and the International Education Act of 1966, P.L. 89-698 (20 U.S.C. 1171–1177), § 2.

Declines in federal support for foreign students are described in Joan H. Joshi, "Finances: How Students and Scholars Fund their Studies in Foreign Countries" (MS [1981], chapter in a forthcoming book on educational exchange, ed. Hugh M. Jenkins). The comparison of the levels of official U.S. support of exchange programs with those of other countries, as well as the quotation of the IEELG in chapter three, are contained in International Educational Exchange Liaison Group, *Enhancing American Influence Abroad: International Exchanges in the National Interest* (Washington: IEELG, May 1981), p. 4, available from the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Material on U.S.–China exchanges can be found in: U.S.–China Education Clearinghouse, *Survey Summary: Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China Currently in the United States, April, 1980* (Washington: U.S.–China Education Clearinghouse, 1980), available from the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs); and Joy Winkie Viola, "The China Connection," *World Higher Education Communiqué*, 2 (Fall 1980): 8–10.

Materials relating to the Iranian student crises of 1979–80 are most conveniently found in the *NAFSA Newsletters* and *NAFSAgrams* issued in those years by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. See also Hugh M. Jenkins and Frederick Lockyear, "Iranian Students in the United States: Status Report," mimeographed (Washington: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, November 26, 1979). Material on the Nigerian students' fees controversy have likewise been the subject of continuing coverage in the *NAFSA Newsletter* from about 1977 onward. The most current assessment is Julie Kyollen Rose, "Nigerian Students: Standards and Responsibilities," *NAFSA Newsletter*, 32 (March 1981): 97, 110–11.

A good, succinct guide for understanding immigration law as applicable to foreign students is Eugene H. Smith and Marvin Boron, *Faculty Member's Guide to U.S. Immigration Law* (Washington: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1980). For a good discussion of Form I-20 abuses,

see Frederick E. Lockyear, "Current Practices in the Recruitment of Foreign Students," in National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions, *Foreign Student Recruitment: Realities and Recommendations* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980), pp. 20–36.

Results of a recent survey of state policies affecting foreign students is contained in IIE, "Report on the Survey of Policy Changes toward Foreign Students in Public Institutions of Higher Education," mimeographed (New York: IIE, October 1981), pp. 5–6.

Economic Factors

Until recently, little attention has been focused on the economic impact of foreign students on the nation and its higher educational institutions. A few analyses have been done on the contributions of foreign students to individual state economies; and IIE for the past few years, as part of its *Open Doors* surveys, has made educated guesses about the amount of money, by state and locale and for the nation as a whole, which foreign students spend on living expenses. See, for example, Institute of International Education, *Open Doors, 1979/80: Report on International Educational Exchange* (New York: IIE, 1981), pp. 56–58. IIE has also, in recent years, attempted to describe the primary source of foreign student funding: for example, see Appendix A, table 1 of the present book, which is taken directly from *Open Doors, 1979/80*. Analyses such as these, however, tend less toward the scholarly and more toward the polemical, that is, toward marshaling a defense of foreign students in economic terms. Some investigators are now turning a more dispassionate eye toward economic considerations. They would profit (as did this report's chapter four) from an examination of Mark Blaugh "The Economic Costs and Benefits of Overseas Students," *The Overseas Student Question: Studies for a Policy*, ed. Peter Williams (London: Heinemann, 1981), pp. 91–110, which, though focused on the British situation, discusses concepts also pertinent in the United States.

American Council on Education

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918 and composed of institutions of higher education and national and regional education associations, is the nation's major nongovernmental coordinating body for postsecondary education. Through voluntary and cooperative action, the Council provides comprehensive leadership for improving educational standards, policies, procedures, and services.